DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 867 CS 501 675

AUTHOR Barnes, Richard E., Ed.
TITLE [Focus: Family Communication].
INSTITUTION Wisconisn Communication Associaton.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 52p.
JOURNAL CIT Journal of the Wisconsin Communication Association; v7 n2 Entire Issue Spr 1977

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Background; *Family (Sociological Unit); Family Relationship; *Family Structure; *Film Criticism; *Marriage

ABSTRACT

This issue of the "Journal of the Wisconsin Communication Association" focuses on family communication and contains the following articles: "Marital Typologies: An Alternative Approach to the Study of Communication in Enduring Relations" by Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, "Intimate Communication and the Family" by Marilyn D. LaCourt, and "A Study in Families--Korean and American: Speculations on the Relationships between Communication and Culture" by Myrvin F. Christopherson and Hyun K. Kim. The remaining two articles, on film criticism and persuasion, are: "Camera, Symbolism, and Character in 'Strangers on a Train'" by Darryl Fox and "The Logic Emotion Duality/Conviction Persuasion Dichotomy: A Reconsideration and an Alternative" by Randolph J. Scott. (LL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

FOCUS: FAMILY COMMUNICATION].

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JOURNAL OF THE WISCONSIN COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

Official Journal of the Wisconsin Communication Association

Editor:
Richard E. Barnes
The University of Wisconsin—
Milwaukee

Assistant Editor:
Myrv Christoperson
The University of Wisconsin—
Stevens Point

Editorial Advisory Board
Terry Rozga, Waukesha Center
Pat Frank, James Madison High School

Volume VII Number 2 **Spring, 1977**

CONTENTS

Letter From the Editor ii
Letter From the President iii

Articles

Marital Typologies: An Alternative Approach to the Study of Communication in Enduring Relations 53
Mary Anne Fitzpatrick

Intimate Communication and the Family 62
Marilyn D. La Court

A Study in Families — Korean and American: Speculations on the Relationships Between Communication and Culture 69
Myrvin F. Christopherson
Hyun K. Kim

Camera, Symbolism, and Character in *Strangers on a Train* 76
Darryl Fox

The Logic Emotion Duality/Conviction Persuasion Dichotomy: A Reconsideration and an Alternative 79
Randolph J. Scott

News and Notes 91

The Wisconsin Communication Association Journal is a Semi-Annual publication (Fall-Spring) of the Wisconsin Communication Association. Subscription, including membership in the Wisconsin Communication Association, is $8.00 per year. Student membership is $4.00 per year. All memberships run from January 1 to December 31.

Single copies of the Journal are $4.00 each. Copies may be purchased from the editor. A limited number of previous issues are available.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wisconsin Communication Assn.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

FROM THE EDITOR:

This issue of the Journal is our initial attempt at a single theme. Three articles relate to our previously announced topics of family communication. The remaining two articles represent the diverse interests of our membership: film criticism and persuasion. I hope that you find this issue of interest and will respond with your comments and criticisms.

Our contributors to this issue range from university faculty to a private practioner. I hope that we can continue to have a mix of contributor qualifications in addition to a variety of scholarly interests. You are encouraged to submit a manuscript for the fall issue. I am particularly interested in receiving material related to organization/occupational communication. However, the issue will not be limited to that theme and all manuscripts will be considered.

Manuscripts should be sent in triplicate to the Editor by no later than August 26. Each manuscript will be reviewed by members of the editoral staff. All copy should be double spaced with the title, author's name and credentials appearing in a cover sheet. References and tables should appear on separate pages following the final page of the manuscript.

Please note that the greater than (>) signs were left out of page 30 in the fall issue. Line seven of the second paragraph should read: $X_1 > Y_1$; $Y_2 > X_2$; $Y_3 > X_3$.

The Editor wishes to thank Kathy Brier for typing the Journal this year.

Richard E. Barnes
Editor, WCA Journal
Department of Communication
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

FROM THE PRESIDENT:

For the past year it has been my pleasure to work with some of the finest communication teachers, administrators, and theorists in the State of Wisconsin. I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Wisconsin Communication Association for their enthusiastic support of the Executive Committee in its efforts to make the study of communication, and the teachers and students who engage in that study, viable, effective, and important.

During the past few years we have become increasingly active in promoting the study of communication and equally active in formulating projects which would enhance that study. As an organization we have initiated regional workshops, improved our journal, persuaded DPI to change certification requirements to benefit speech teachers and our students, improved our conventions, increased our membership, and have begun a resource project with DPI which will be a model for the nation. The Executive Committee and the members of Standing and Ad Hoc Committees have genuinely put forth a consistent effort to enhance the profession and make positive contributions to all of us who teach and study communication arts in Wisconsin. They attended statewide meetings and conferences, usually on Saturdays, without remuneration for meals or milage. I hope you appreciate as much as I the time, money, and above all, the energy they have volunteered. Speaking of money, I believe it is appropriate to mention here that, as of this writing, Pat Townsend informs me that we have a balance of about $1600.00, representing a solvency we have seldom experienced in the past.

The time is crucial for the WCA and for the study of communication. Much of our efforts and concerns regarding certification, admission standards, getting a required secondary course in speech, membership, and professional outreach will be manifest at the forthcoming Spring Convention. Elaine Schroeder has put together a relevant, significant combination of speakers, programs, and features for us at Eau Claire. I hope you will join your friends and colleagues May 7-8 for I am certain that you will find it an important and meaningful convention.

Cordially,

Craig R. Streff
President

MARITAL TYPOLOGIES: AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF COMMUNICATION IN ENDURING RELATIONSHIPS

Mary Anne Fitzpatrick

In every field of inquiry, typologies help scholars to conceptualize and bring order to the phenomena that they study. Over the past few decades, scholars in the marriage and family studies area have attempted to organize the field as well as map out their research by establishing typologies of relationships. Many of the marital typologies have been proposed either by observers working in clinical settings, investigators reflecting on data collected for other purposes, or theoreticians working with the benefit of little or no empirical support.

In order to create a relational typology, it is necessary to classify marriage relationships by criteria which are objective enough to allow replication and consensus among scholars. Previous writers and researchers in this area have departed rather radically from these prerequisites for typological construction. None of the previous typologies have developed a reliable way of placing couples into types. In many cases only the investigator-clinician seems capable of having the insight to decide which couples are Vitals, Gruesome-Twosomes or Masters and Servants.

This paper reviews some of the work done in relational typologies and reports the results of two studies conducted to develop an empirically derived typology of marital relationships.

Review of the Literature

The typologies selected for this review are representative of current conceptualizations about relationships. They have been selected to give the reader some idea of the many directions that typal construction has taken in the past few years. Some of the category systems refer to family groups but with slight modification can be applied to male/female dyads as well. For the most part, however, these taxonomies or typologies emphasize "normal" families or relationships and do not include those based on disordered or pathological relationships.[1]

One of the most common distinctions made in the literature is between the conventional or traditional marriages and equalitarian or companionate ones.[2] Over eighty-five years ago, Willcox noted the difference between what he termed despotic and democratic families. Using slightly different terms, Burgess and Locke, as early as 1945, claimed that the American family was moving "from institution to companionship".[3]

An institutional (traditional/conventional) family emphasizes the values of law, mores, and authority while a companionate (equalitarian) family emphasizes the values of mutual affection, common interests and consensus. Adams, for example, defines the conventional marriage as one in which the husband is granted the role of disciplinarian, breadwinner, economic coordinator, and decision-maker. The conventionals place primary emphasis on legal authority. The wife is the homemaker and the childrearer and normally subordinate to her husband in other areas of family life.

Mary Anne Fitzpatrick (Ph.D., Temple University, 1976) is an Assistant Professor of Communication, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Unlike the conventionals, husbands in equalitarian marriages, although seen as breadwinners, actively participate in socializing roles and home tasks. Equalitarians share responsibility for decision-making. The wife in this type of relationship may work outside the home or do volunteer service, yet she still has a tendency to be primarily responsible for homemaking and childrearing.

Thus, these two types differ in respect to the source of social control that regulates their relationships. The behavior of husbands and wives in the institutional relationships is derived from sources outside the dyad. The control of behavior in companionate relationships, however, is derived from mutual affection and geared toward the mutual compatibility of the partners.

Some relationship typologies focus on differences in specific areas such as decision-making. Burgess and Wallin[4] classified the decision-making of couples as either authoritarian, verbally coercive, or mutual. According to Burgess and Wallin, a couple's decision-making pattern is related to the emotional dependence or independence of the individuals. Emotionally dependent relationships are characterized by the reliance of one partner upon the other for reassurance, appreciation, and affectional security. In emotionally independent relationships, on the other hand, the persons do not require emotional support from each other. When one member is emotionally dependent and the other one emotionally independent, the decision-making pattern is an authoritarian one. The emotionally independent person makes the decisions. In couples where both are dependent, there is a pattern of mutual decision-making. The issues are discussed in an equalitarian fashion. The decision-making of the emotional independents, on the other hand, is marked by verbal coercion or persuasion. Emotional independents use verbal coercion to exert strong pressure on a partner to consent.

Raush and his associates found two types of couples in their longitudinal research on communication and conflict at the National Institute of Mental Health.[5] Couples who saw themselves as happily married were capable of exhibiting radically different conflict styles. One type of couple used primarily avoidance strategies to deal with the quasi-naturalistic conflict situations used in the study while another type used engagement strategies to handle the same situations.

Drawing on the same sample of newlyweds as Raush and his coworkers, Goodrich proposed a taxonomy of marriage based on semi-structured interviews, observer reports, interaction analysis, and self-report questionnaires.[6] A profile analysis of the one hundred and sixty-four variables collected by these techniques suggested a relationship between close family connections at the newlywed stage and low affective involvement between marital partners. The categories established by Goodrich are, however, somewhat limited since they apply only to the newlywed stage of marital relationships.

Using Lewin's field theory as a conceptual framework, Levinger attempted to explain marital stability and instability by extending Goode's metaphor of the empty shell marriage to encompass other types.[7] According to this metaphor, an empty shell marriage is characterized by strong boundaries or "restraining forces", forces which act to keep a person from leaving the relationship. Although the boundaries in this relationship are strong, there is relatively little attraction between the partners. The relational partners do not discuss their problems or experiences and communication is kept to a minimum. Although the hostility in such a relationship is often great, conflict is restricted to small issues.

In contrast to the empty shell marriage, a full shell marriage is characterized by strong boundaries and high attraction. These marriages are marked by an open and expressive communication pattern, including a conflict resolution style similar to that described by Raush and his associates as the engagement style.

A half shell marriage has weak boundaries and high attraction and is probably characterized by less conflict than the other patterns. The no shell marriage with its low attraction and weak boundaries is so unstable that specific predictions about communication behavior are hard to make; it is probably characterized by high levels of destructive conflict. Divorce or separation is expected to occur most often with the no shell marriages. One of the advantages of this typology is that it is one of the first to stipulate that the dimensions of stability and satisfaction are independent of one another.

One of the most widely quoted typologies of marriage was developed by Cuber and Harroff more than a decade ago.[8] This typology was formulated after extensive interviews with over four hundred (400) upper middle class Americans; it delineates the patterns by which these people lived together, found sexual expression, reared children, and made their way in the outside world. Two major patterns emerged.

The first major kind of relationship was labeled the utilitarian. A utilitarian relationship is established or maintained for purposes other than the expression of an intimate or highly important relationship between a man and a woman. Such marriages exhibit an absence of deep and empathic feeling between the partners as well as limited companionship.

There were three subtypes that fell within the utilitarian category: conflict-habituated, devitalized, and passive-congenial couples. Conflict-habituated couples fought all the time, although little was ever resolved between them. Devitalized and passive-congenial couples emphasized things in their relationships. Civic and professional responsibilities, property, children, and their reputations were of primary importance to both devitalized and passive-congenials.

The second major type of relationship discussed by Cuber and Harroff was labeled intrinsic. Intrinsic partners view their relationship as the central aspect of their lives. In intrinsic marriages, the sharing and togetherness of the partners is genuine. The presence of the relational partner is often indispensable to the feelings of satisfaction that any activity provides.

The clinical experience of Lederer and Jackson led them to suggest that relationships vary along dimensions other than those uncovered by Cuber and Harroff.[9] To Lederer and Jackson, the most important factor is whether a relationship is defined as symmetrical, complementary, or parallel. A symmetrical relationship is one in which the spouses continually need to state to each other through their behavior, "I am as good as you are." A complementary relationship is one in which (at the extreme) one person has complete control in certain areas of decision-making while the other exerts hegemony in different spheres. In a parallel relationship, the spouses alternate between symmetrical and complementary definitions in response to changing situations.

A few years after Lederer and Jackson, Reiss developed a relationship typology grounded in one of the few programs of systematic experimental research on

family problem solving.[10] This typology assumes that each family develops its own shared and distinctive explanation of its environment and evolves principles to govern its people and events. Given this characteristic orientation toward the environment, each type manifests a unique pattern of problem solving.

Another information-processing typology has been developed more recently by Kantor and Lehr.[11] These authors arrive at a view of families as information-processing systems that emphasizes the communication, norms and structures that each couple or family develops. Their typology is organized around a spatial metaphor, the central question being: How does a family metaphorically or figuratively impose distance among its own members and between members and the outside world. In other words, the central concept of the model is the way in which a family maintains its territory and regulates the distance among its members.

The three relational types delineated by Kantor and Lehr can be discriminated according to how each type uses the access dimensions of space, time, and energy, to achieve their relational targets or goals concerning affect, power, and meaning. Since these authors have developed a very detailed exposition of their three relational types, specific aspects of their arguments will not be elaborated in this article. How each type uses space, time, and energy to gain affect, power, and an understanding of life's meaning is easily accessible in Inside the Family. It is important to note, however, that Kantor and Lehr's open, closed, and random couples utilize the access and target dimensions in markedly different ways.

A Critique of the Existing Typologies

A typology should create a conceptual schema for describing social phenomena as well as establish operational criteria to assign given relationships to a particular type.[12] Many of the typologies reviewed in the previous section are little more than theoretical speculations without a data base or operational procedures for obtaining one.[13] Even those writers who do base their typologies on clinical interviews usually do so in an unsystematic and subjective fashion, without establishing any a priori criteria for the identification of patterns or the naming of types.[14] Finally, those few typologies that do attempt to base their schema on some empirical data base suffer some severe methodological flaws.[15]

Since none of the previous typologies have developed a reliable way to place couples into types, a new approach to relational typologies seems needed. First, it is necessary to propose a number of theoretical dimensions of relationships. Then, relational types can be empirically identified based on how couples claim to utilize or value these important theoretical dimensions. Recent research by Fitzpatrick has followed this strategy.[16]

The Empirical Derivation of Relational Types: Two Studies

The research question that guided the two studies discussed in this section was:

> How many discrete types of enduring heterosexual relationships will emerge from an empirical examination of the major dimensions by which couples define their relationships?

The first step in the research was to produce a measuring instrument that could reliably assess some of the significant aspects of relational life. Although the names for the dimensions often differ, the access and the target dimensions identified by Kantor and Lehr have been repeatedly acknowledged by other authors as the most important aspects of relational life.[17] Given the pervasiveness of these factors emerging in both theory and research on relational life, it seems reasonable to assume that relational partners make decisions about how to organize access to particular targets.

Using the energy, space, time, affect, power and meaning concepts as discussed by Kantor and Lehr as well as the issue of autonomy/interdependence in a relationship,[18] over two hundred questions were generated. Each item corresponded either to an access or a target dimension. Twenty-five additional questions were written concerning autonomy/interdependence.

Over nine hundred subjects were interviewed in the first study. The sampling strategy was to gather a large sample of married individuals who would complete the lengthy questionnaire in their homes. In an effort to avoid any response set which might exist in a population of sophisticated test takers, the majority of the respondents were contacted outside the university community. Questionnaires were distributed to political and social groups, in hospitals, schools, factories, offices, and apartment buildings predominantly in the Philadelphia standard metropolitan statistical area. Every attempt was made to have each of the two members of the relationship complete a questionnaire; that is, both the man and the woman.

Through factor and item analysis, the original scale was reduced to a sixty-four item, eight factor instrument.[19] The instrument was called the Relational Dimensions Instrument (RDI).

The first factor on the RDI reflects all six of the dimensions stipulated by Kantor and Lehr. Of the twenty-three items loading on this factor, ten are concerned with affect, while the remaining items spanned the other dimensions. The affect pattern typified by this factor indicates a continual and mutual exchange of thoughts and feelings exists between the relational partners. A high score on this factor would suggest an open sharing of love and caring and the tendency to communicate a wide range and intensity of feelings. There is a sharing of both tasks and leisure time activities, as well as a considerable degree of mutual empathy. Finally, these relational partners not only visit with friends but also seek new friends and experiences. Given the high frequency of interaction between this couple as well as between the couple and the outside world, this factor is called Sharing.

Factor two contains five of the original six dimensions of Kantor and Lehr. Of the eleven items that define this factor, seven were originally conceived as meaning items. These items suggest a strong commitment to tradition and to conventional values and institutions. Traditional customs are stressed, such as: a woman should take her husband's name when she marries, infidelity is always inexcusable, and the wedding ceremony, per se, is important. Those who score highly on this factor exhibit a certainty about the meaning and purpose of life, in general, as well as the rules that should govern childrearing and family behavior. The lifestyle of these relational partners is a traditional one, and is consistent with Bott's finding that the more traditional the couple, the more likely their networks are closed.[20] In other words, almost all of this couple's

friends know one another. This factor is labeled the Idealogy of Traditionalism.

The six items that correlate with the third factor also predominately reflect the meaning dimension. In contrast to the second factor, however, this pattern emphasizes an openness to uncertainty. Indeed the ideal relationship, from this point of view, is one marked by the novel, the spontaneous, or the humorous. The individuals who score highly on this factor seem open to change. They believe that each should develop his or her own potential and that relationship should not constrain an individual in any way. For these reasons, this factor is considered the Idealogy of Uncertainty and Change.

Factor four contains six items that were originally constructed to reflect the power dimension of a relationship. Four of these items tap an interpersonal persuasion, inducement, or combativeness aspect of a relationship. However, the other two items are concerned with the separate cooking and eating of meals and open arguing before friends or in public, and hence, broaden the factor to one of assertiveness toward the relational partner. Thus, the best name for this factor is Assertiveness.

Factor five consists of three items that are clearly associated with the time dimension. These items suggest a strict scheduling of household events. For this reason, the factor is called Temporal Regularity.

The four items that load on the sixth factor reflect the affect dimension. These items suggest the avoidance of arguments and disputes between the relational partners as well as the importance of sharing good rather than bad feelings. This analysis suggests that Conflict Avoidance is an appropriate name for this factor. Support for this factor label comes from the work of Raush and his associates who discovered two distinct patterns of conflict management in the couples they observed. One of those behavioral patterns was Conflict Avoidance. This factor probably taps the self-report component of the behavioral pattern.

The five items that correlate with factor seven were originally conceived of as spatial items. These items seem to indicate that few constraints are placed on territorial boundaries. The relational partners feel free to open each other's personal mail, to interrupt one another when concentrating, and to share many of their personal belongings with impunity. Respondents with high scores on this factor believe that guests should feel free to enter any room in their homes. They also believe that guests may be brought home without asking the other's permission. The spatial freedom of those who score highly on this factor comes at the expense of privacy. Given this openness between the partners, as well as their openness to guests, this factor is called Undifferentiated Space.

Factor eight consists of six items that are predominately concerned with space. In contrast to the spatial fusion of the seventh factor, however, these six items signify a spatial fission. Both spouses take separate vacations and each has his or her own private space. Private space is highly valued by those who agree with these items. Finally, the fact that such couples can go for long periods of time without spending much time together suggests that this factor can be named Autonomy.

Having decided on the content of each of the eight subscales of the Relational Dimensions Instrument produced by the factor analysis and the item analysis, it was necessary to examine their reliability. Nunally maintains that the most

sophisticated way to determine the reliability of a scale is to compute coefficient alpha.[21] The overall alpha for the RDI is .71. This is the reliability of each scale divided by the number of items per scale.

Sixty-eight couples participated in the second study which was designed to isolate the relational types. The median age of the subjects fell between thirty and thirty-nine; on the average, each couple had been living together between six and nine years. Sixty-one of the couples were married, but only eighteen individuals had been married more than once. Thirty percent of the sample reported that they had no children. Of those who had children living at home, the median number of children was two.[22]

All one hundred and thirty-six (136) subjects completed the revised sixty-four item Relational Dimensions Instrument. Based on these scores, couples were assigned to types through a procedure called linear typal analysis.[23] The linear typal analysis isolated three major relational types based on responses to the Relational Dimensions Instrument.

Relationship Type 1 seems to be the one most committed to an idealogy of uncertainty and change. This type exhibits less temporal regularity in its daily schedule than the others and is opposed to a belief system that stresses traditional values. Although this is the most autonomous type, it is nonetheless defined by a moderate amount of sharing between these partners and not much conflict avoidance. Within the relational context of sharing, this couple also experience autonomy. Apparently, it is a negotiated autonomy. Given this balance of autonomy and interdependence, Type 1 is labeled the Independents.

Relational Type 2 is primarily defined by greater conflict avoidance, more differentiated space, and less sharing. This type keeps a fairly regular daily time schedule, but despite their separated space Type 2 persons do not feel particularly autonomous. This relational type lacks a strong commitment or aversion to either the idealogy of traditionalism or the idealogy of uncertainty and change. For these reasons, and because the type seems separated yet neither autonomous nor interdependent, they are referred to as Separates.

Relationship Type 3 subscribes to a fairly traditional belief system. These individuals prefer a high degree of temporal regularity as well as very little autonomy. Very few boundaries are stipulated in their use of physical and emotional space. This type is marked by a high degree of sharing and a corresponding tendency to engage rather than avoid each other when conflict arises. Finally, Relational Type 3 is opposed to an idealogy that values uncertainty and change. Since this relationship is marked by a high degree of interdependence and very little autonomy within the framework of a traditional value system, couples in this type are called Traditionals.

Conclusion

The findings of these two studies are quite encouraging. Although it is premature to claim that the three relational types isolated in this study constitute the only possible relational types, it is beneficial to realize that couples can be reliably classified according to their beliefs and standards on significant relational issues. Although it is possible that there are additional types not tapped in this research, future research is expected to uncover Independents, Separates, and Traditionals.

The typological method linked with empirical data collection is a fruitful one for studying communication in relationships. By classifying, isolating, and systematizing the salient aspects of relationships between marital partners, typologies allow us a clearer idea of the communication and interaction styles of various relational types. Communication scholars and practitioners who view relationships through a typal framework are more likely to examine the goals and functions of a relationship in order to understand interaction styles.

Finally, the typological method is heuristic in that typologies suggest a number of hypotheses concerning communication and relationships. As a consequence of these two studies, research is currently being conducted on dyadic adjustment and sex role orientations among the Traditionals, the Separates, and the Independents.

FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example, A. L. Voiland, Family Casework Diagnosis, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962).

2. B. N. Adams, The American Family: A Sociological Interpretation, (Chicago: Markham Publishing, 1971).

3. J. W. Burgess and H. J. Locke, The Family: From Institution to Companionship, (New York: American Book Company, 1948).

4. E. W. Burgess and P. Wallin, Courtship, Engagement and Marriage, (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953).

5. H. L. Raush, W. A. Barry, R. K. Hertel and M. A. Swain, Communication, Conflict and Marriage, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

6. W. Goodrich, "Toward a Taxonomy of Marriage," in J. Marman (ed.), Modern Psychoanalysis: New Directions and Perspectives, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968); see also, D. W. Goodrich, R. G. Ryder and H. L. Rausch, "Patterns of Newlywed Marriage," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, (1968), pp. 383-389.

7. G. Levinger, "Sources of Marital Dissatisfaction Among Applicants for Divorce," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36, (1965), pp. 803-807.

8. J. F. Cuber and P. B. Harroff, Sex and the Significant Americans, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965).

9. W. J. Lederer and D. D. Jackson, The Mirages of Marriage, (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968).

10. D. Reiss, "Varieties of Consensual Experience, I: A Theory for Relating Family Interaction to Individual Thinking," Family Process, 10, (1971), pp. 1-27.

11. D. Kantor and W. Lehr, Inside the Family: Toward a Theory of Family Process, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975).

12. C. G. Hampel, Aspects of Scientific Explanation, (New York: The Free Press, 1965).

13. Lederer and Jackson. See also, Levinger.

14. Cuber and Harroff. See also, Kantor and Lehr.

15. For a complete methodological critique, see M. A. Fitzpatrick, A Typological Examination of Communication in Enduring Relationships. Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Temple University, 1976.

16. Ibid. See also, M. A. Fitzpatrick, "Relational Types and Dyadic Adjustment." Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1977.

17. See R. D. Hess and G. Handel, Family Worlds: A Psychological Approach to Family Life, (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1959).

18. A. Bochner, "Conceptual Frontiers in the Study of Families: An Introduction to the Literature," Human Communication Research, 2, (1976), pp. 381-397.

19. A complete description of the sample, procedures, statistical analysis and results of the development of the RDI may be found in Fitzpatrick, 1976.

20. E. Bott, Family and Social Network: Roles, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families, (London: Tavistock Publishers, 1957).

21. J. Nunnally, Psychometric Theory, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

22. A complete description of this sample can be found in Fitzpatrick, 1976.

23. J. E. Overall and C. J. Klett, Applied Multivariate Analysis, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972).

INTIMATE COMMUNICATION AND THE FAMILY

Marilyn D. La Court

"Home is the place where when you have
to go there they have to take you in."

Robert Frost
Death of the Hired Man

For most people, the family represents both a group from which to escape and a refuge from the storm. Few of us choose our families, and most of us would like to change them, or at least change some of the attitudes and behaviors of their members. Sometimes we are proud of them, and other times, like Peter with Jesus, we'd as soon deny we know them. Nonetheless, most of us are born into a group of people who say they care about us; we don't always believe them, but they say they do. Why is this caring perceived to exist and yet so frequently misunderstood? It may be a misunderstanding of parents and children regarding the status and power control of parents that blocks intimate communication between them.

From the moment of birth, we engage in a struggle for peership with our parents, and they hold all, or at least most, of the trump cards. As time passes, we manage to discover all manner of devious, creative, and manipulative ways to exercise our potency toward the ultimate attainment of this peership. At last we arrive at what our society naively labels maturity and begin to establish another family group. This time, as parents, we hold the trump cards. Now, however, we find that the deck is loaded; the trump cards turn out to be duty cards, and we pay for our power with responsibility. We have a responsibility to see to it that our children learn to function effectively within the social system, that is, to become good citizens. We have a responsibility to see to it that our children develop their cognitive potentials; and, now, we are being challenged to see to it that they develop their affective potentials as well. They are to become thinking, feeling, valuing persons, and it's up to us to make it happen. No wonder parents are reluctant to relinquish their status and power control in the family group. If they are to accomplish all that is expected of them by society, by their children, and by themselves, they need to retain realistic power and control over their dependent young. Some of us, however, carry predetermined plans for our children's socialization and future success a little too far. A birth announcement I received read: Mr. and Mrs. John Schmidt proudly announce the birth of their eldest son, Doctor John Schmidt, on April 1, 1973, 8 lb 2 oz.

There are numerous circumstances that contribute to the fact that there is an imbalance of power and status in the family and that parents and their children do not consider themselves to be each other's peers.

Marilyn D. La Court (M.A., University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 1976) is vice president of Human Interaction Laboratories, Inc. and an instructor in the Department of Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

It is not within the scope of this paper to do an in-depth analysis of the concepts of peership, status, and power in the family. For the purpose of clarity in further discussion, however, these terms are defined as follows: Peership is determined by the degree to which people perceive themselves to be equal in terms of status and power in the family group. Status is determined by the degree of value attributed to family members by other family members especially with regard to their actual and perceived power. Power is determined by the degree to which family members can control the behaviors, feelings, and values of other family members.

The question is raised: Is it possible for parents and their children to establish intimate relationships before the issue of peership has been settled, before the controlling power has been more evenly distributed, and in spite of the broad experiential differences between the two age groups?

Some have suggested that there should be a required course for all prospective parents. There are numerous instruction manuals available for parents to use in raising their children. Some mothers in the 50's, along with some liberated fathers, relied on Dr. Spock. Behavior modification techniques seem to be in vogue right now; Parent Effectiveness Training is a technique that teaches humanistic methods of child rearing. One common characteristic that all these approaches share is that they instruct parents in techniques with which to control their young and to shape them into the kind of individuals who are highly valued by the social system. Much of the power that parents do allow their children is nothing more than a patronizing strategy to ease tension and to insure the parents their own ultimate power. This is sometimes necessary. It doesn't make much sense to go into a detailed discussion regarding the relative merits of the afternoon nap. A strategy suggested by many current humanists, and some behaviorists as well, might go something like this: "Would you rather pick up your toys and then take your nap, or do you want to take your nap first?" This seems like a reasonable patronization of the power status of the three year old. While one method or another of child rearing can legitimately be used on children, establishing intimate relationships with them is a different matter.

A good interpersonal relationship is described by Rossiter and Pearce (1975) as one in which there is regularity and reciprocity of self disclosure in an atmosphere of honesty and validation between peers. An intimate relationship is not something one person has with another but rather something two people create and share with each other. Even though Mommie may know many "intimate" details about Johnnie, Mommie cannot have an intimate "relationship" with Johnnie unless Johnnie also has an intimate relationship with Mommie. Techniques of child rearing prescribed for parents to "use on" their children seem to be self-defeating to the cause of two people creating and maintaining an intimate relationship with each other.

This paper proposes a method through which parents and their children can work together toward improving their relationships and increasing their intimacy. In addition to sharing the responsibility for creating intimate relationships with their children, however, parents must relinquish their intent to control in a manner consistent with their children's needs for potency and their children's ability to participate in an intimate relationship.

Current literature on interpersonal attraction indicates that mutual disclosure is a very intricate aspect of any intimate relationship, and that empathic understanding is necessary if disclosure is to occur on an on-going basis. Lickona (in Huston, 1974), using a cognitive-developmental approach to understanding interpersonal attraction, intimates that the quality of relationship an individual is capable of maintaining depends heavily on the degree to which the person's cognitive abilities have developed. At what point does a child become capable of empathizing and, therefore, capable of participating in an intimate relationship? There does not seem to be a straight forward answer to this question. Lickona reports research findings of Flapan (in Huston, p. 53) indicated "...the age between six and nine years is the most important transitional phase in the development of inferential and explanatory thinking about interpersonal events." Lickona considers early adolescence to have "considerable importance in the development of mature reflexive thought that underlies self-analysis, flexibility, and mutuality in the interpersonal realm." He goes on to state, "With increasing powers of inference and understanding of social causation should come higher levels of empathy, sympathy, communication, and ability to solve interpersonal conflicts." It is possible to conclude that somewhere during early adolescence a person becomes theoretically capable of at least a minimal level of empathic understanding. Indeed, Lickona goes on to caution that, if this ability to empathize is not achieved during this crucial time, it may become increasingly more difficult to do so later. He states, "An eighteen year old who is still functioning below the level of full formal operations is less likely ever to achieve that level than a thirteen year old who is preformal operational. In this sense, early adolescence could be considered a sensitive period in cognitive-structural development and, therefore, an important period in the development of the capacity for mature friendship and love." He poses the challenging question, "Given the fact that people have a number of developmental levels available to them, what circumstances facilitate functioning at the person's highest level?"

Besides the child's and the parent's cognitive level of development, there are other obstacles to the achievement of intimate relationships between them. A complaint often expressed by parents of young teenagers is: "My daughter/son doesn't tell me any of the personal details of his/her life." There are a number of possible explanations for the fact that teenagers often do not confide in their parents, many of which can be directly attributed to the greater status and power of the parent. These include the following: 1. There is no reciprocity. The parent does not disclose to the daughter or son either. 2. There is a need for privacy and for the younger person to experience her his own potency in exercising the right to remain silent. 3. The concerns or problems that make up the content of disclosure may too closely involve the parent. 4. There is a fear of rejection or punishment for unsanctioned behaviors or for what may be considered inappropriate feelings or values that differ from those thought to be closely guarded by the parent. 5. It seems more appropriate to disclose to someone perceived as a peer. 6. The skills involved in self-disclosure have not been learned by either parent or adolescent.

Why do parents generally not disclose to their children while at the same time expecting, almost demanding, that their children disclose to them? Derlega and Chaikin (1975, p. 29) suggest one possible reason, "People view disclosure by a person to someone of higher status as more appropriate and less unusual than disclosure to a person of lower status. However, people judge disclosure to a peer as most appropriate. The dynamics behind these results may reflect the notion that the discloser is placing himself symbolically on a comparable

level with his target. Since few people desire to reduce their status, self-disclosure to a lower status individual is regarded as somewhat inappropriate and unusual."

It is easy to understand the plea of the parent who when feeling hopelessly left out, therefore, out of control, bemoans the fact that fourteen year old Jennifer doesn't tell her/him the most important details of her life. Yet, it seems reasonable that when reciprocity of disclosure is not forthcoming from the parent, the request for openness from the adolescent sounds more like a demand for a confession and another attempt to maintain control than like an attempt to establish a more intimate relationship between them. According to Levinger (in Huston, 1974, p. 106) mutual disclosure is an important aspect of intimacy. He contends, "In an intimate relationship there will be a sharing of emotionally significant attitudes or feelings." Sharing implies a reciprocity of disclosure. The status hierarchy between parents and other members of the family group may be a block to mutuality of disclosure. Yet, it appears that reciprocity is absolutely essential. Does this mean that parents must "tell all" if they expect their children to disclose honestly to them?

Altman and Taylor (1973) analyze self disclosure and degrees of intimacy based on the depth and breadth of the content of disclosures shared. The most intimate relationship is described as one in which disclosures include the widest possible subject area with the most in-depth self and other knowledge exchange. Viewing disclosure within this framework, I conclude that because of the experiential differences and the status and power differences that necessarily exist between adults and teenagers only minimal intimacy is possible. Furthermore, taking into consideration the appropriateness factor of disclosure, parents may have a reality-based and justified reason for not establishing intimate relationships with their children. Yet, parents are morally and socially challenged to take responsibility for their children's development of full cognitive and affective potentials. Lickona's conclusion that adolescence is the crucial stage within which to develop the capacity for mature friendship and love, and his challenge for us to determine what circumstances facilitate functioning at the person's highest level beckons us to look further and to ask questions again. Is it possible for parents and their children to establish intimate relationships before the issue of peership has been settled, before the controlling power has been more evenly distributed, and in spite of the broad experiential differences between the two age groups? Perhaps we are asking the wrong question. Let us consider instead, is it possible for parents and their children to experience the process of intimate communication with each other?

Rossiter and Pearce (1975) propose that it may be more important to consider how we tell and how we listen than what we tell and how much we tell. In other words, content of disclosure is not considered as important in communicating personally as is honesty and validation between the people involved in the relationship. If intimacy is measured by the process of communication experienced between family members rather than by the content of their disclosures to each other, the degree of intimacy experienced between parents and their children can operate at maximum potential within each person's appropriate level of cognitive development. Further, if intimacy is viewed as a process, skills with which to communicate in this manner can be isolated and taught. These skills can be taught to all family members who have reached at least a minimal capacity for empathic understanding.

In answer to Lickona's challenge regarding the circumstances that facilitate functioning at a person's highest possible level, I propose teaching the skills necessary to the process of communicating empathic understanding (with family group members) in the laboratory or educational setting. Just as a person has the potential to read at some given age, he/she also has the potential to empathize. While a person might learn to read and to empathize without formal education, the process can be more efficient by teaching skills under controlled conditions. The group setting can offer an opportunity for mutual investment in relationship formation and development for both parents and their children as opposed to the one-sided approach of instruction manuals or groups consisting exclusively of parents or children. In addition, the quality of relationships experienced in the present can be increased as well as the facilitation of the ability to create meaningful friendship and love relationships in the future. Another benefit to teaching family members simultaneously involves the environment within which to practice and integrate the skills. Family members can provide each other with the supportive environment outside the laboratory setting as well as within it, thus, facilitating the practice and integration of these skills on an on-going basis.

What are these skills, and how can they be taught? In order to disclose honestly, one must become aware of her/his own feelings and values. Group members can be given criteria with which to analyze the extent to which people on video training tapes are in touch with their own feelings. This criteria is defined as follows: The person who denies, justifies, explains away, intellectualizes, or attributes blame for feelings to circumstances beyond the self is considered to be out of touch. The person who accepts, labels, expresses feelings with emotional proximity, identifies the source of her/his feelings, and takes responsibility for them is considered to be in touch. Training tape examples can be discussed with regard to specific components contained in the statements made and the degree to which a speaker is in touch. Following this experience, training tapes can provide stimulus material designed to evoke an emotional response from family members. Members can be asked to respond to these experiences by disclosing their affective or emotional states, thus, giving them the first-hand experience of getting in touch with their own feelings and disclosing them.

The next phase of the training would involve analyzing responses designed to communicate empathic understanding. Again, a criteria with which to analyze the extent to which a listener's response communicates empathy can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the process. Specific skills involved in active listening include responding to the speaker that the message and the person have been heard and understood. Any intent of the listener to control the speaker is relinquished, and there is no attempt to solve problems or give advice.

Techniques involved in giving and receiving descriptive feedback can be taught and practiced in the group setting. Finally, group members can be given an opportunity to practice skills involved in communicating empathic understanding. Interactions between family members can be video taped and the process of communication between them analyzed.

In the laboratory or educational setting, privacy of all family members must be respected regardless of age or status. The content of disclosures is expected to be honest, but the subject matter to be discussed is entirely up to the discretion of the discloser. Allowing individuals, regardless of status or power

in the family group, the freedom to make their own choice of disclosure content is considered a relinquishing of the intent to control. This facilitates a more equitable distribution of power between family members and addresses itself to the issue of content appropriateness and the need for privacy. It also takes into consideration the experiential and cognitive differences between age groups. At the same time, it allows for the process of intimate communication to be experienced in a peer-like relationship. Actively listening to the disclosure of a family member in a validating manner, and communicating empathic understanding without making value judgments, giving advice, or attempting to solve problems is considered another relinquishing of the intent to control and another means of more equitably distributing power between family members.

When first confronted with relinquishing control of another person, it is possible for a parent to incorrectly assume that this means immediate and absolute abolition of all house rules. By necessity, some behaviors need to be controlled by parents. However, acknowledging and accepting individual power and relaxing the intent to control with regard to values and feelings can serve to more evenly distribute a reality-based power and status in the family as well as to smooth the path toward the ultimate realization of peership between parents and their children.

According to Van Atta and La Court (1976), the intent to control and the intent to understand from the other's point of view may be mutually exclusive. They state, "When one relinquishes the effort to control another person, he/she may find that her/his influence upon the other person increases. This, of course, does not imply that the other person acts according to the first person's wishes. People in such a relationship are co-workers, but not equals. This implies individuality with variations in strengths, weaknesses, potentials, limitations, values, feelings, and beliefs. Van Atta and La Court, in their rationale for teaching these skills maintain, "Needs for love, intimacy, and affection are part of the human condition. These needs cannot be fulfilled in an atmosphere of tension, deception, competition, and unresolved conflict. Communicating empathic understanding through ownership of feelings and active listening and asserting a genuine and congruent self can serve to release tension, minimize deception, and create an atmosphere through which disagreements can either be accepted or resolved through cooperation."

Respecting the privacy of the individual, relinquishing the intent to control when in the process of attempting to understand, and learning the skills involved in communicating empathic understanding can facilitate the experiencing of the process of intimate communication between parents and other family members who have reached at least a minimal capacity for empathic understanding. The experiencing of this process can increase the quality of relationships experienced in the present as well as help to prepare individuals for friendship and love relationships in the future.

REFERENCES

Altman, Irwin, and Taylor, Dalmas, A. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Derlega, Valerian J., and Chaikin, Alan L. Sharing Intimacy: What We Reveal to Others and Why. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1975.

Huston, Ted L., ed. Foundations of Interpersonal Attraction. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rossiter, Charles M., Jr., and Pearce, W. Barnett. Communicating Personally: A Theory of Interpersonal Communication and Human Relationships. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs Merrill Company, Inc., 1975.

Van Atta, Ralph E., and La Court, Marilyn. Fundamentals of Human Interaction: A Group Members' Handbook. Human Interaction Laboratories, Inc., 1976.

THE SPEECH DEPARTMENT OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE

WELCOMES THE WISCONSIN SPEECH ASSOCIATION CONVENTION 6 & 7 MAY 1977

While you are here, take time to look at the facilities on our campus:

The Kjer Theatre, the Riverside Theatre, the studios of WUEC, the television production studios, the classrooms of the Fine Arts Center on Water Street.

Also consider attending school here where highly qualified professionals offer programs in the following areas:

COMPREHENSIVE SPEECH
PUBLIC ADDRESS
THEATRE
ORAL INTERPRETATION
RADIO AND TELEVISION
INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION
SECONDARY EDUCATION (both Speech and Theatre certification)

To supplement the course work this department operates a first-class Forensics and Debate program, a very complete Theatre program, (including summer stock), a new FM radio station, and a television production studio.

A STUDY IN FAMILIES--KOREAN AND AMERICAN: SPECULATIONS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE

Myrvin F. Christopherson
and
Hyun K. Kim

Which is best--"old-fashioned discipline" or the "new permissiveness"? Most of us have probably been a participant or observer in discussions over this issue at some time. In this essay, we hope to challenge readers to address this issue again. Specifically, we examine dominant social and cultural values which govern relationships between members of the traditional South Korean family and suggest some of the ways in which these values differ from those which seem to govern a family in the United States today. Finally, we discuss some of the communication competences and awarenesses which each environment produces and provide an answer to a variant of our original question--Which is better for communication--"old-fashioned discipline" or the "new permissiveness"?

The Oriental society is characterized by traditional norms which emphasize respect to older people and submission to parents. Despite the inroad of Western culture in the area, tradition is still strongly entrenched in the minds of South Koreans and millions of their Asian neighbors.

South Korea has been profoundly influenced by Chinese and Japanese cultures because of geographic proximity. Korea was under Japanese rule for 35 years until the end of World War II. After the war, American culture partially eroded the old, traditional culture of Korea, but American culture and its communication patterns are still alien to most South Korean people. Since North Koreans are under Communist rule, they have developed a set of totally different cultural values and communication patterns. In the Communist country, subservience to the state takes precedence over the traditional authority of the family. Father is called "comrade father" and mother, "comrade mother." Below the 38th parallel, South Koreans remain a part of the Chinese and Japanese cultural group.

Confucianism, which dates back to the system of values formalized by its founder in the Sixth Century B.C., has had a strong influence on Koreans to the time of European contact.[1] Confucian philosophy holds that a good life depends upon a knowledge and observance of the proper behavior between one individual and another.[2] Confucianism taught Koreans filial piety toward parents[3] and male dominance.[4] Buddhism is another religion that affected Korean life, but its influence was not so great in practical daily conduct. While Buddhism taught the life after death, Confucianism was only interested in affairs of this world[5] and preached "the right relationship toward human beings."[6] For hundreds of years, Confucianism was the basis of education and a subject for civil service examination.

Myrvin F. Christopherson (Ph.D., Purdue University, 1965) is a professor and chairman of the Department of Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.

Hyun K. Kim (Ph.D., Southern Illinois University, 1975) is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.

Confucianism also taught repression of all emotions and avoidance of all extremes. This trend can still be found in the attitude of the Korean people -- sometimes over-polite and sometimes expressionless.[7] Koreans have been taught to be very cautious in verbal and non-verbal communication. Girls of traditional Korean families were taught to refrain from expressing emotion. In this strict tradition, a Korean bride has no "right" to smile on her wedding day. If she smiles, other people will ridicule her and say that she may expect to have only girls as children.[8] As we will see, boys are valued above girls.

A closer look at the relations between members of the South Korean family reveals how potent the family is in shaping the communication habits of every man, woman and child. The story of the Korean family can be told through discussion of the relations between (1) father and eldest son, (2) husband and wife, and (3) between brothers and sisters.

Father-Son

Under the traditional form of authority, patriarchism is by far the most important type of domination. According to Max Weber, patriarchism refers to the authority of the father, the husband, the senior of the house, the sib elder over the members of the household and sib. Thus, custom dictates that the eldest son becomes the head of the family when the father dies. As head of the family, the father and his successor are granted absolute respect and authority to make decisions for the entire family. According to the custom, the younger family members, especially the females, must show the proper respect to the superior authority of the eldest male and abide by decisions he makes. Often grandfather, rather than father, is the superior family authority.

The implications for family communication of this male-dominated seniority system should be clear. Communication between a traditional father and his son is likely to be infrequent, dispassionate and "one-way." The father makes decisions for the family, without consultation or delegation. Out of respect for his father, the son is expected to remain silent and listen while father speaks. Moreover, the son must hide any disagreement he may have out of respect for the superior wisdom tradition has granted to his elder. It should come as no surprise that a decision as important to family life as choice of date or spouse should be under parental control in the traditional Korean family.

Osgood suggests that the traditional relationship between father and son is not "a union of familiarity and demonstrable affection."[9] Indeed, he continues: "Custom dictates that a father be restrained in his attitude toward his successor and he often appears coldly distant . . . The father also becomes the symbol of the disciplinarian and is apt to be a strict one in practice. The son must show utter respect regardless of how he really feels, and it would be strange if he did not often resent such a one-sided relationship . . . As children, they (sons) run to their mother for relief and she is known as the "kind parent," he is the "stern" one.

Husband-Wife

The status of Korean women has undergone significant change in recent years.

Today there are female legislators, high government officials, lawyers, medical doctors, actors, and professors. Nevertheless, their status lags far behind that of American women in terms of equal rights in some statutory laws including property law, employment opportunities and divorce alimony. For example, a will decides who gets the parents property in the United States; in South Korea the eldest legitimate son automatically inherits his father's property. Another example is that Korean women are awarded only a nominal sum after divorce. Divorce itself implies disgrace to the Korean woman and a bleak future for her unless she is a professional.

Osgood observes that Koreans have tended "to carry the ideal of male superiority to a point of pseudo-isolation even from their wives."[10] Given the subordinate status of Korean women, communication is one-sided in favor of the male in the traditional Korean family. A Korean wife is taught to believe that to show respect for her husband is the most important thing for a happy family life. Although there are apparent exceptions in some houses where the woman quietly "wears the pants" in her own family, it is rare for a Korean woman to express her anger by slamming the door or yelling at her husband. If an American husband comes home from the office very late without prior arrangement, his wife would not be expected to conceal her anger. Naturally, this pattern of response holds only so long as the culture supports it. Many Korean wives living in the United States show growing signs of assimilation into the American culture and set aside submission to their husband in favor of a more egalitarian relationship. The legacy of male supremacy does not imply that the wife is disrespected by her husband. Expression of respect by the husband for his wife is also expected. For example, no husband in the Asian country calls his wife by her first name. A Korean husband calls his wife "yobo," which is similar to "honey." But "yobo" is never used with children. It is a special word which is used only between husband and wife, not even between lovers. Language usage in the Korean culture permits the wife equality in this expression; she also calls her mate "yobo."

In most of the Asian cultures, using the first name, except in father-child, teacher-student relations, is regarded as an expression of disrespect. Even between close friends, except childhood friends, first names are not used; male adults in South Korea generally address their friends as "brother Lee," "teacher Lee," or "Mr. Lee." Female adults call their friends "someone's mother," "Madame Lee," or "Mrs. Lee."

Between Brothers and Sisters

Communication between and among brothers and sisters in South Korea is also different from the American pattern. Suppose a traditional Korean family has four sons and two daughters. Suppose further that they were born in the order of two boys, two girls, and another two boys. The sixth child will never use the first names of his brothers and sisters; he will call them "eldest brother," "second elder brother," "first elder sister," "second elder sister," and "third elder brother." It is improper to call another by the first name unless the other is younger.

Traditional Koreans teach their children to adopt established traditional values and norms. They want their children to respect their parents, grandparents, older relatives, elder brothers and sisters, and even older people in the

neighborhood. When they talk to older persons, no matter who they are or what they do, Korean children are trained and expected to use polite words. These traditional values and norms are preserved by many South Korean males in the United States, and it often leads to a conflict between a traditionally-oriented husband and his wife who is assimilated into American culture. A factor analytic study of Korean families living in Los Angeles indicates that Korean-Americans in the city face "continuing conflicts between the authoritarian values of Korean culture and the values related to individual freedom which characterizes American culture."[11]

Other nonverbal signs of respect often employed by the younger toward their seniors include bowing upon meeting an elder, removing glasses, and maintaining a proper distance. It is not uncommon for a mature married adult son, out of respect for his father, to refrain from smoking in his father's presence unless permission is granted.

When a Korean family goes for a walk; members respect the traditional authority hierarchy; children follow after their parents in order of age rather than walking abreast hand-in-hand as is often the custom in the United States. In this brief look at the traditional Korean family we have seen that superiority is based on age and sex. We have also seen that superiority discourages display of affection and intimacy in favor of more distant, polite and formal relations between father and son, husband and wife, and between brothers and sisters. So long as the society at large re-enforces the propriety of these value orientations, they will remain customary in Korean culture.

Examination of the contemporary American family would reveal that Americans tend to value equality, individuality, openness, mobility and innovation. While the father has traditionally been the head of the household, the bread winner and the chief disciplinarian, the wife assumes any or all of these roles in some families and is quite well accepted in them. U.S. men and women typically share and support one another in daily application. All family members are assumed to be equally important, to have equal "rights" without assumption of equal or identical power or responsibility in any activity.[12]

Children, male or female, old or young, enjoy relatively equal status in the American family. Some privileges, of course, accrue with age. For example, one is permitted access to the family car upon reaching 16. Similarly, custom may encourage males to display proper masculine and females proper feminine behaviors, but conformity to stereotypes is generally discouraged. Most importantly, brothers and sisters are equally worthy of full participation in this Western democratic culture.

Which of these value orientations, Korean or American, provides the more ideal environment for interpersonal communication? The answer must obviously be that interpersonal communication will occur in any environment. Indeed, many authorities argue that it is impossible to not communicate in copresence because it is impossible to not behave. The argument continues, all behavior which is taken into account by another communicates.[13] Hence the submissive behavior of the Korean wife or son toward the dominant husband and father permits interpersonal communication to take place as do the more tolerant displays of individualistic expression characteristic of exchange between an American husband and wife or parent and child. The crucial difference is that South Korean and American

families offer different environments which require a different manner of relating. These environments encourage and reinforce development of some communication competences and awarenesses and discourage the development of others.

In any culture, people will tend to communicate with, i.e., relate to, one another in a manner and form which is valued in that culture and which serves the dominant goals of the society. The family assumes responsibility for the socialization of children for itself and for the society at large. As Nye and Berardo put it "unsocialized individuals are a liability, even a threat to society."[14] Families in South Korea or in the United States are no exception.

When we compare the families discussed in this essay we note that the traditional patriarchal Korean family prepares children selectively according to sex and order of birth. The American family tends to socialize all children more equally. Furthermore, the Korean family tends to encourage and reward development of and expression of reverence for older males and relatively less display of respect for those who are younger and female. It should come as no surprise to us that Koreans are more practiced in showing reverence and respect than Americans. Americans, on the other hand, would tend to develop analytical skills to evaluate a speaker or writer based on what he says and how he presents himself rather than on when he was born or whether he is male or female. Korean speakers and writers tend to enjoy greater orlesser credibility in the family depending upon their age, sex and order of birth. To the extent that these factors prevail, they tend to discourage those who are not favored by birth from developing communication competences in argumentation, message construction and audience adaptation and other competences which may assist one in becoming more influential in persuading others to accept one's views or to assume positions of influence in society. The effect is to prepare a communicative as well as a social elite.

While in the American family children might suffer some loss of direction owing to a more fluid center of authority, the Korean child is left with a clear picture of where authority resides in the Korean family. The child need not wonder who will decide or whose permission must be sought. The father and later the eldest son, carry the authority for the family. In the American family, practice differs greatly from one household to another and in the absence of a clearly assigned authority center, children are left to seek the power wherever it resides at the moment--whether in the hands of father or mother. Thus it is not at all uncommon to find a child playing mom off against dad in requests for permission. "Ask your father", "Ask your mother", the child hears.

The Korean family appears to offer a clearer, more stable authority model in that the roles of the members are more sharply defined and reinforced by generations of culture. Margaret Meade, commenting on the typical British and U.S. family, suggests an advantage which an authority-based household offers:

> ". . . Typically in England the father is the head of the household, and . . . no one questions his authority. Thus the father speaks at the table from the position of authority. Since it is unnecessary to establish his authority through arguing, the father may understate his opinion; the children seen but not heard, listen attentively and in growing up come to initiate the authority style of father. In the U.S., however, families are more democratic or child-centered, and since the children may do more of the speaking, dinner-table

conversations bear the characteristics of children's talk: exaggeration, loud voices, discontinuity. The result, Mead suggests is that American children grow up with no other model than themselves and become only older children."[15]

Undoubtedly, the American value orientation which recognizes equality and dignity in every family member without regard to age or sex, leads to a heightened concern for how to relate to each other. A popular guide for parent-child communication in the last decade in America, argues that in order to improve communication between parents and children we need a new code of communication based on respect and skill. The author, Haim G. Ginott, writes: "It requires (a) that messages preserve the child's as well as the parent's self-respect; (b) that statements of understanding precede statements of advice or instruction."[16]

What is interesting about Ginott's "new code" is that it reflects an American value orientation. It suggests that children should be permitted to communicate as equals with their parents and that the child needs and deserves special care and understanding in the form of statements, preferably verbal statements. Further, this orientation holds that making statements indicating that you understand how the child feels will lower his defenses and help the child to accept the advice. Such a code would, we think, appear out of place in the traditional Korean household. Presumably, the Korean child learns to respect, accept and obey his parent's advice without the help of "new code" messages. Every encounter with parents would affirm the authority of the parent and the submission of the child. There would be no need for any such new code.

It should be made plain, however, that the potential for individual growth and creative expression could be discouraged, if not denied, by the authoritative patriarchal model provided in the traditional South Korean home. Indeed, such an environment appears stifling to those of us who value free expression in a free society based on representative, participative democracy. But stifling as it may appear to us, to those who value quiet respect, order, predictability and the comfort of doing things the established way, the Korean family is the model of preference.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Cornelius Osgood, The Koreans and Their Culture (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1951), p. 24.

[2]Ibid., p. 28.

[3]Max Weber, The Religion of China, translated from the German and edited by Hans Gerth (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 157.

[4]Ibid., p. 162.

[5]Ibid., p. 155.

[6]C.K. Oh, Handbook of Korea (New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1958), p. 72.

[7]Ibid., p. 72-73.

[8]Osgood, The Koreans and Their Culture, p. 109.

[9]Ibid., p. 48.

[10]Ibid., p. 330.

[11]Won H. Chang, "Communication and Acculturation: A Study of Korean Ethnic Group in Los Angeles," a paper presented at the 1972 Convention of Association for Education in Journalism, Carbondale, Illinois, August 21-22, 1972, p. 31.

[12]F. Iwan Nye and Felix M. Berardo, The Family: Its Structure and Interaction (New York: The Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), p. 8.

[13]Paul Watzlawich, Janet Beavin and Don D. Jackson, The Pragmatics of Human Communication (New York: W.W. Norton, 1967), pp. 48-51.

[14]Nye and Berardo, The Family: Its Structure and Interaction, p. 8.

[15]Margaret Mead, "A Case History in Cross-National Communication" in The Communication of Ideas, ed. Lyman Bryson (New York: Harper and Row, 1948), pp. 209-29 as reported in John C. Condon and Fathi Yousef, An Introduction to Intercultural Communication (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1975), p. 76.

[16]Haim G. Ginott, Between Parent and Child (New York: Avon Books, 1965), p. 25.

CAMERA, SYMBOLISM, AND CHARACTER IN STRANGERS ON A TRAIN

Darryl Fox

In Hitchcock's Films, Robin Wood makes repeated references to Hitchcock's "spectator trap"--the way he allows the audience (through voyeuristic identification with a character) to live out a desired experience, then turns it about to create an unpleasant realization.[1] The uneasiness that results from this turning of the tables is the feeling that the viewer has at the end of the scene in which Bruno kills Miriam in Strangers on a Train. Hitchcock achieves this through his visual suggestion of the chase, use of sexual symbolism, and his development of the moral ambiguity of Miriam and Bruno.

When Bruno gets on the bus following Miriam and her two boyfriends, we know that he intends to kill her. Hitchcock's camera work suggests the chase that we know is occurring, and he develops the chase in such a way that we will be left with conflicting feelings when Bruno kills Miriam.

In this scene Hitchcock uses a repetitive shot sequence which emphasizes Bruno's stalking of Miriam. He uses a 3-shot sequence which consists of: low angle medium closeup of Bruno--long shot of Miriam and her boyfriends (Bruno's point of view)--medium long shot, slight low angle, of Bruno as he follows them (approximately Miriam's point of view).

This pattern occurs twice in the early portions of the scene. After leaving the bus, Bruno stands at the entrance to the fairgrounds, watching Miriam and her boyfriends at the ice cream stand. They leave the stand, and we see the three shots for the first time, as Bruno follows them toward the midway. This is interrupted by a little boy with a balloon, but is repeated immediately afterwards as Bruno resumes his pursuit.

The relationship between Bruno and the other three within a frame also emphasize the pursuit that is occurring. The first time that Bruno is seen with Miriam he pops out of nowhere. At the "Test Your Strength" machine she looks over her left shoulder for Bruno, but doesn't see him. She begins to turn to her right, and is startled to find him standing next to her.

From here Miriam and her boyfriends go to the roundabout, with Bruno close behind. On the roundabout Bruno sits on the horse immediately behind Miriam, never taking his eyes off of her, and leans past the post the horse is on, much as if he's riding a real horse at full gallop.

When they leave the roundabout for the boat ride, Bruno appears to become a fourth member of their party. In this sequence Bruno has visually drawn closer and closer in his pursuit of Miriam, and in the Tunnel of Love we see Bruno's shadow overtake the shadow of his prey.

Darryl Fox (M.S.T., UW-Stevens Point, 1976), is an instructor at West Bend West High School.

Hitchcock continually shoots Bruno as the dominant character in this scene, further emphasizing the sense of pursuit. He is almost always shot alone--the scene begins with a medium shot of him standing at the entrance of the midway as he watches the other three at the ice cream stand. In the medium long shots of him walking down the midway there are very few other people in the frame. The shots of Bruno are always in medium depth of focus--whatever is behind him appears blurred, further emphasizing that Bruno is most important.

These shots are contrasted in Hitchcock's 3-shot pattern, with the shots of Miriam and her boyfriends. Usually seen in a long shot in the earlier portions of the scene, they are in deep focus amidst a group of people. The sensation created by this is a feeling that they are nearly lost in the crowd. By cutting from this shot to a shot of Bruno, Hitchcock jarringly reminds us that the carefree trio are the prey of a hunter.

Hitchcock uses camera angle as well to portray Bruno's dominance in the chase. Bruno is always shot from a low angle. In the 3-shot sequences Bruno is seen from a very low angle, then walks to, and past, the camera as he follows Miriam. As Bruno gets his ticket for the roundabout, the camera shoots him at low angle from the side, and follows him as he walks onto the roundabout. These shots contrast with eye-level shots of Miriam and her friends, predominantly in long shot from behind. The result of the juxtaposition of shots is that Bruno seems powerful--shot from below, he overpowers the camera as he walks into it. The long shots of the trio present them as the unknowing quarry of Bruno, as they flee the camera.

Sexual symbolism appears throughout this scene, emphasizing the link between perverse sexuality and violence that exists within Bruno. The first obvious example of this occurs just after the characters arrive at the amusement park. Bruno watches the trio at the ice cream stand and Miriam "turns, gazing round the fairground through her spectacles, licking at her ice cream like a spoilt schoolgirl, looking at once childish and sensual, and her eyes fix on Bruno, watching her from a distance."[2] Miriam's apparent interest in Bruno here is significant, for it creates a negative impression early in the scene.

The next example of this is at the "Test Your Strength" machine. Miriam's two companions are unable to ring the bell of the great phallic symbol. Bruno, between suggestive glances at Miriam (which are returned by her) is the only one of the three to ring the bell, and he breaks the machine. The analogy to potency is obvious.

Robin Wood points out the constant presence of sexual symbolism in the circularity of the rides on the midway.[3] He also says that this symbolism increases as the four people go to the boat landing to leave for Magic Isle. The dock is hung with, and we see Bruno surrounded by, pendulant Japanese lanterns that look like breasts. Their boats leave the dock and enter the Tunnel of Love (the analogy to penetration is obvious) where Bruno's shadow overtakes Miriam's.

With the sexual "enactment" complete, the boats proceed to Magic Isle--that place where one can live out his fantasies. When Bruno leaves Magic Isle he walks through a field where lovers have congregated, but he is alone. The fantasy that Bruno can live out is not sexual, that has already been visually completed. His fantasy is that other half of the dichotomy within him, violence--he has the chance to realize his dream of the perfect murder.

The third thing Hitchcock does to create his "view trap" is to develop the moral ambiguity of Miriam and Bruno. Our feelings about the impending murder are initially torn. We know that Miriam is a despicable person, yet we feel some pity because she is the unknowing prey of Bruno. We detest Bruno's cold-blooded pursuit of Miriam, yet agree with him that "some people are better off dead." Hitchcock develops this tension further in this scene.

At the opening of the scene Miriam licks her ice cream cone rather sensually as Bruno watches her. When their eyes meet, she registers some interest in him. As they walk through the midway Miriam glances over her shoulder at Bruno, who maintains a look of cold determination.

At the "Test Your Strength" machine they exchange suggestive glances--Bruno wiggles his eyebrows and Miriam gives him a teasing smile in return. This continues on the roundabout, where Miriam casts coy smiles at Bruno behind her.

This development heightens the mixed feelings of the viewer, leading us deeper into the trap Hitchcock has prepared. We hate Miriam more because she is such an obvious tramp--leading on a stranger, while she is out with two other men. Yet we pity her more because Bruno coldly uses this to make her murder that much easier. We also hate Bruno much more because of the calculating way in which he uses Miriam in order to finally kill her, but we feel more strongly that she really does deserve to die.[4]

Hitchcock uses these three elements--camera work, symbolism and character development--to create an emotional trap that the viewer cannot escape. We want Bruno to kill Miriam. Yet, because of our feelings about Bruno, we really hesitate to endorse his act. The internal tension the viewer feels, and the uneasiness with which he is left after Miriam's murder, makes this one of the best examples of the Hitchcockian trap.

FOOTNOTES

1. Robin Wood, Hitchcock's Films (New York: Castle Books, 1965), pp. 18-25, 54-55.

2. Ibid., p. 48.

3. Ibid., pp. 48-49.

4. Gordon Gow recognizes this in his discussion of the film when he says, "If we deplore Bruno, we also has a little compassion for him, and a measure of understanding as well." Gordon Gow, Hollywood in the Fifties (New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1971), p. 58.

THE LOGIC EMOTION DUALITY/CONVICTION PERSUASION DICHOTOMY: A RECONSIDERATION AND AN ALTERNATIVE

Randolph J. Scott

> Here is resumed that age-old debate between those who stand for truth and those who stand for opinion, between philosophers seeking the absolute and rhetors involved in action. It is out of this debate that the distinction between persuading and convincing seems to arise.[1]

Rhetorical theorists have maintained a distinction between two categories of argument for at least twenty-two centuries.[2] Perelman addressed the issue of the conviction-persuasion dichotomy while Cronkhite wrote about the logic-emotion duality. The focus of this paper concerns the logic-emotion duality--what it is, how it has been defined and theorized about, and whether or not it exists. Later, an alternative to it will be offered as a pedagogical instrument. In the opinion of this writer, one cannot address the logic-emotion duality without considering its relationship to the conviction-persuasion dichotomy.

I - The Logic Emotion and Conviction-Persuasion Duality

The basic separation between conviction and persuasion has carried through from Aristotle into modern times. According to Baird, "Most writers on persuasion, speech, and rhetoric have accepted the distinction between conviction and persuasion." Baird continues and states that persuasion tends to be identified with emotional communication while conviction is identified with severe and logical argumentation.[3] Assuming that Baird's analysis is correct, a direct link is established between conviction and persuasion, and logic and emotion. Logical appeal would be appropriate for conviction, and emotional appeal would be appropriate for persuasion. The viability of this assumption will be dealt with later.

A useful distinction would be to separate conviction and persuasion, and logic and emotion as ends and means. The presumption of the conviction-persuasion dichotomy has specific ramifications that relate directly to the logic emotion duality. If the speaker, during the invention process, accepts or assumes the conviction-persuasion dichotomy and resulting differences in ends, then he should structure his appeals accordingly as either primarily logical or primarily emotional, or as means to those ends.

In the words of Irving Lee, "The duality (conviction-persuasion dichotomy) is an outgrowth of the analysis of the mind into a set of faculties in which the understanding and the will are conceived as the powers or actions of the mind."[4] Sanborn elaborates further, "Apparently, if the speaker relies mainly on 'logical means,' he is arguing, If he relies mainly on 'imaginative and emotional suggestion,' he is persuading."[5]

Randolph J. Scott (M.A., Northern Illinois University, 1975) is Lecturer in Communication Arts at University of Wisconsin-Fox Valley Center.

Any distinction made by a speaker based on the conviction-persuasion dichotomy as to whether he is actually convincing or persuading his audience is dependent upon his perception of his affect. Such a distinction makes no provision for actual measurement for what occurs inside the hearer's skin of course. What is actually occurring within the hearer and what is perceived by the speaker as occurring within the hearer are not necessarily analogous. As Woolbert pointed out, "We discuss this issue, not in terms of what the responder actually does, but in terms of what the observer perceives him doing."[6] Woolbert extends his analysis to include the perception of an "observer". The observer may be the speaker himself, a rhetorical critic viewing the communication situation, or some other party besides the intended receiver of a communication, and the same analysis would seem to apply. For instance, only the receiver of a communication is capable of determining the impact of any given communication upon him, and even then the receiver may not think in terms of whether he has been convinced or persuaded.

Woolbert cited a method whereby conviction and persuasion were supposedly differentiated: "I contended that we have come to look upon hidden responses as the aim of conviction, and overt responses as the aim of persuasion."[7] The utility of such a distinction must be seriously questioned. For example a receiver may, in fact, be persuaded without demonstrating any overt behavior indicating that persuasion has taken place. In addition, an observer may not detect "overt responses" on the part of the receiver during the rhetorical act, yet the receiver may overtly respond at a time when he is not being observed. In other words, the observer may not be in a position to measure the behavioral change on the part of a receiver for at least three reasons: First, the observer cannot get inside the receiver's skin to measure what is happening. Second, persuasion may take place without overt response on the part of the receiver, thus leaving it unobservable. Third, overt response may occur in a situation where an observer cannot or does not see it. If conviction takes place vis a vis "hidden responses" there is no way, through observer perception, to determine if conviction has occurred within a receiver. Other methods for determining conviction and persuasion can be designed and used.

Obviously, when conviction and persuasion are separated as ends with logical appeal and emotional appeal separated as discrete means to those ends, we can observe the flaws of the logic-emotion duality. Yet even with the inherent flaws as evidenced above, the duality has been a hotly debated issue in American rhetorical theory.

II - History of Theory on the Logic-Emotion Duality

Hopefully, the above analysis has raised serious questions as to whether conviction and persuasion should be linked to logical and emotional appeals. Concomitant to the challenge of separating conviction and persuasion is the question of separating logical and emotional appeals. There are obvious parallels between the two issues.

Mary Yost fired the opening round of dissension early in this century. Yost argued against the acceptance of conviction and persuasion as separate elements. Her claim was that the terms conviction and persuasion were explained during a time when the assumptions of faculty psychology were popular--that the mind was divided into three compartments, the reason, the emotion, and the will. In Yost's words, "Today, however, the leading psychologists have found these assump-

tions inadequate to explain the phenomena of the mind."[8] Yost replaced the old faculty psychology idea of psychological pluralism with one of psychological monism. She argues that, "A conception of the mind as an organic unit performing a particular function--reasoning, feeling, willing--as may be demanded by the situation the individual is meeting, has taken the place of the rigid formal idea."[9]

Shortly after Mary Yost had raised her objections to the conviction-persuasion dichotomy, Woolbert began a series of articles in the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education voicing similar objections. "My thesis is that any division of appeal and speech into conviction and persuasion is unsound from the point of view of psychology and unnecessary from the point of view of rhetorical theory."[10] Woolbert's apparent justification for the conviction-persuasion dichotomy being psychologically unsound seems to be based upon the following:

> For them (psychologists) there is only one concept that describes what happens when an organism is stimulated in any and all possible ways, and that concept is expressed in the terms action, or its synonyms, activity and reaction--as the psychologist uses them--all mean fundamentally the same thing.[11]

Woolbert's observation takes on increased importance when he states, "The psychologist cannot today make a distinction between 'physical' action and 'mental' action; to him it is one and the same thing."[12] Recall that earlier in this paper, conviction was seen as covert (inside the skin) reaction and persuasion as overt (outside the skin) reaction. Since psychologists in Woolbert's time could not distinguish between physical and mental action or reaction it follows that this is how Woolbert justified the conviction-persuasion dichotomy as indefensible in view of rhetorical theory.[13] The reasoning is that if psychologists could not distinguish between the two, neither could rhetorical theorists.[14] Conviction and persuasion were seen as one process by Woolbert. "The two processes called respectively conviction and persuasion are thoroughly interwoven..."[15]

Fifteen years after the writings of Yost and Woolbert, Edward Rowell considered the conviction-persuasion dichotomy in his "Prolegomena to Argumentation." Rowell accepted both the duality and psychological monism.[16] Rowell's writings at this time were concerned primarily with an overview of persuasion and it wasn't until 1934 that Rowell specifically addressed the issue of conviction versus persuasion. Rowell made the point that "the impulse to recognize some sort of a duality in relation to rhetorical processes is well-nigh universal."[17] He advanced the idea that the duality appears as a "semi-naive distinction" that humans utilize to signify differences in the character of their experiences.

Rowell cautioned scholars to avoid blanket acceptance of Aristotle on the duality, noting that, "When we say that rhetorical appeal can be dichotomized, that there are two 'sides' to it, we must not take that to mean that there are two unconditionally segregable kinds of rhetorical appeal."[18] His point is that since there are two ways of believing, affectively or rationally, there should also be two ways of "estimating the elements of rhetorical appeal, the logical and psychological."[19] Later, Rowell explicated how Aristotle established the rationale for the duality.

> Aristotle, deeply involved in the human struggle for reliability in knowing, introduced into rhetoric the standards which he found essential in reasoning, and gave them a primary place in his system. These standards made a dichotomization of rhetorical appeals as inevitable as it made inevitable the more definite dichotomization of the grounds of belief. And this is the point in Aristotelianism which we have retained in our conceptions of the duality.[20]

Rowell takes issue with the psychological monists. He argues that psychological monism makes no repudiation of the distinctions between reasoning, feeling and willing saying that, "All it denies is the idea that these forms of behavior are expressions of individual faculties. This monism is as pluralistic as it is monistic."[21] The point that Rowell seems to make is that man may, and perhaps does, distinguish between appeals or even whole speeches that seem to be more of degree than of kind. "It is evident, therefore, that the duality may enter into the communicator-audient situation from the side of the communicator or of the audient or both."[22]

While Rowell disparaged the conviction-persuasion dichotomy based on the assumptions of faculty psychology and on the basis of covert versus overt response as a measurement of conviction or persuasion, he did accept the dichotomy for other reasons.

> ...viewed in the perspective of human culture the two sides of our duality represent not merely a technical dichotomy in the influences that make for belief but also two very vital human interests. The interests are, first, knowledge (truth, certainty) and second, persuasion (moving people to desired beliefs and actions by means of discourse)...were rhetoric to ignore a distinction between them it would be worthy of severe condemnation on simple human grounds.[23]

The rhetoric of the Sophists was concerned with persuasive value. Rowell's chief justification for the dichotomy seems to be a recognition for a need not only for moving people to desired ends (persuasion) but also to provide a method for recognizing truth, ethics, and logic (conviction). Rowell supports the dichotomy philosophically but does recognize psycho-physiological ramifications in doing so when he says "Belief may be grounded in feeling or in rationality. It is usually grounded in both. Rationality is not something that operates independently of the non-rational."[24] Remember, as noted earlier, that Rowell also admitted that there probably are not "two unconditionally segregable kinds of rhetorical appeal."

Much confusion and considerable argument has occurred over the years as to whether conviction and persuasion should be or could be differentiated. In addition, similar arguments and confusion have surrounded logical and emotional appeals.[25] Should they be separated? Can they be separated? Are logical and emotional appeals really part of the same process? Much of the confusion seems to stem from the tendency to approach and answer these questions from fundamentally different perspectives, and that answers are provided on fundamentally different bases.

Look first at the conviction-persuasion dichotomy. It represents ends which a rhetorician may wish to demonstrate more than it represents what may actually occur within a receiver. This dichotomy is acceptable as long as it is considered

from the point of view of philosophy. This claim is based upon Rowell's analysis provided above. The dichotomy becomes suspect when considered from the points of view of phychology and psysiology. If the distinction between conviction and persuasion is based upon covert-overt acts upon the part of the persuadee the dichotomy becomes useless and meaningless for reasons that were given earlier: 1- The persuader cannot get inside the receiver's skin to measure what kind of response is taking place, 2- Persuasion may take place without overt response on the part of the receiver, 3- The observer may not be in a position to measure the receiver's overt response, overt response may occur long after the persuasive event. Perhaps it is here where philosophers who recognize a need to inject rhetoric with social responsibility (an ethic, truth, validity based upon probability) and psycho-physiological behaviorists who recognize that conviction and persuasion cannot be separated, come to odds.

The same kind of fundamental distinction can be made when considering the logic-emotion duality, or, means. The philosopher might argue that logical or rational appeals would contain propositions related to truth, formal validity, probability. Emotional appeals would be those that move people to desired beliefs and actions without necessarily regarding truth or probability, although, probability or validity could be contained within them. Perhaps emotional appeals would be explained in terms of the way in which the Sophists argued--without particular regard for the truth, with concern only in persuading. Perhaps the philosopher would recognize that the two types of appeal cannot really be separated, as Rowell noted, but should be separated to provide for social responsibility and a means for getting at the truth--things which do not necessarily follow from the use of "emotional" appeal. Rhetorical theorists and psycho-physiological behaviorists, concerned primarily with the function of appeals and what they do, probably could not accept a dichotomization of rhetorical appeals. They might say as Sanborn does that, "The fabric of persuasion is a weave of the elements of motivation and what may be called 'logical argument.' The fibres blend so completely that no separate analysis or consideration of each may be made."[26] To the behaviorists, the important questions might deal with the kinds and intensities of responses that various sorts of appeals cause. Both the philosopher and the behaviorist are concerned with legitimate questions, but because of different approaches they arrive at different answers.

III - Cronkhite's Paradigm: One Alternative to the Duality

Cronkhite complains, "It is rather uncomfortable to maintain a distinction which cannot be defended."[27] His complaint is grounded in the practice of writers of textbooks on public speaking effecting a compromise: "They have argued, while the two cannot be separated in reality, they can be separated in theory for pedagogical purposes."[28] Cronkhite's discomfort and his contention that appeals cannot be separated in reality are apparently caused by the way in which he perceives reality--as a behaviorist. However, it seems likely that a philosopher with a non-behavioral orientation toward reality would experience no discomfort in separating logical and emotional appeals. In fact, it would seem likely that a philosopher such as Edward Z. Rowell would be just as uncomfortable as Cronkhite if a philosophical dichotomy of appeals were not made. His rationale for distinguishing appeals is that it serves to make "rhetoric more complete scientifically, more worthy ethically, and more true sociologically by recognizing the interest embodied in the Sophistical emphasis and planting into it a technical treatment of man's interest in solving his problems by means

of reliable knowledge."[29] The ambitions of Cronkhite and other behaviorists probably run concurrent with these goals in regard to rhetorical purpose and rhetorical impact. In other words both sets of scholars wish to reach the same destination, they just refuse to ride together.

Cronkhite provides a distinction that seems acceptable to both factions. He chooses the terms "cognition" in place of logic and "activation" in place of emotion "to avoid the distracting associations which have formed around the terms 'logic' and 'emotion'."[30] Cronkhite takes the psychologically monistic approach that activation and cognition are functions of a unified nervous system but "nevertheless demonstrate considerable independence."[31] He explains that sensory input from external sources take at least two routes once inside the body, "one through the classical sensory pathways to specific parts of the cortex, and the other through a non-specific mass which has been labeled the reticular activating system."[32] The reticular system "reacts indiscriminately to impulses from all sensory modalities: and responds "differentially only to stimulus intensity."[33] The reactions within the reticular system (or the ends) are apparently differentially affected by varying intensities of appeals (or means). Briefly, some appeals cause more intense activity than do other appeals. The reticular system activates the rest of the nervous system and the body as a whole.[34] The importance of stimulation of the reticular system increases as activation of this system is necessary to the function of the cortex; while the cortex seems, in turn, to excite or inhibit the reticular system by means of feedback circuits.[35] The significance of this is examined below.

A further, even more important possibility for persuasion arises when the following is considered:

> ...electrical stimulation in structures intimately related to this reticular system is capable of producting eating, drinking, and sex-related behavior, as well as the affective or 'emotional' responses subjectively described as 'fear,' 'rage,' and 'pleasure.'[36]

Since varying appeals cause varying amounts of electrical stimulation of the brain in this area, it could be argued that the more powerful or intense the persuasive appeal, the more intense the stimulation in the brain in the area of the reticular system. As a consequence, the likelihood of "appealed to" behavior taking place is greater using Cronkhite's paradigm as a method for isolating appeals to be used in persuasion.

Cronkhite argues that verbal stimuli may elicit distinguishable cognitive and arousal responses but makes two qualifications. The first is that no part of the nervous system operates completely independently of any other, and second, that any response to a symbolic stimulus must, by definition, involve some cognition. Simply to form words and sentences involves some cognition, and conversely, to interpret the words and sentences of another also involves cognition. But the important point is what defines the intensity of response on the part of the receiver--the intensity of the rhetorical appeal.

Cronkhite offers his paradigm of persuasion as a means for both inventing and measuring rhetorical appeal. The underlying philosophy of the paradigm, as explained by Cronkhite, seems to be: "A persuasive communication can, on a simplified level, be viewed as an attempt to induce the audience to perceive a relationship between two concepts, in order that audience attitudes toward one

will transfer to the other."[37] Cronkhite's paradigm is similar to Burke's idea of consubstantiality. Consubstantiality refers to the similarity between people or identification between them. According to Burke, the more two people see each other as alike, the greater the likelihood for persuasion taking place.[38] The emphasis in Cronkhite's paradigm is not specifically on consubstantiality among people but on consubstantiality of concepts used by a persuader to persuade his audience--as perceived by the audience.

Two major kinds of concepts are identified by Cronkhite. First is the "object concept" which is the object toward which the persuasion is directed. Cronkhite explains it as a concept toward which the audience has not formed attitudes, or if formed, attitudes which the speaker considers capable of being altered. Second, the speaker must choose the motivational concept, or, a concept which the persuader sees as having sufficient motivational characteristics for the persuadee. Third, the persuader must attempt to establish a relationship (consubstantiality) between the object concept and the motivational concept.

Several points need explaining at this juncture. First, the relationship the persuader is attempting to establish toward the object concept may be either positive or negative. The negative relationship would work like consubstantiality in reverse toward the object concept and would be used if it were the persuader's goal to attempt to cause the persuadee to perceive the object concept negatively. Therefore, the persuader may attempt to present either a positive or a negative relationship between the object concept and the motivational concept depending upon his purpose. Second, how the elements of the paradigm relate to logical and emotional appeal is clarified by the following:

> ...the impact or activation value of the motivational concept is what rhetoricians usually mean by emotional appeal, and ... the induction of audience perception of the relationship as ... they usually mean by logical argument.[39]

Third, just as there may be several arguments in support of a thesis in a persuasive speech, there may be several motivational concepts in support of a single object concept.[40] Fourth, obviously, considerable audience analysis will have to have taken place on the part of the persuader during the invention process if his motivational concepts are to have any perceptual bearing on the object concept as perceived by the receiver. The success of the persuader is incontrovertibly and directly linked to how successfully he analyzes his audience.

Cronkhite argues that his paradigm of persuasion offers both a rationale for the invention of rhetorical appeal and a means for measuring the effects of rhetorical appeals.

> The goal of the speaker, stated in these terms is to establish a 1.00 probability of causal relationships proceeding from the object concept to the motivational concepts. The job of the critic in evaluating logical argument or concept association is to determine how nearly the speaker accomplished that goal in the minds of the audience.[41]

Clearly Cronkhite's method for measuring the impact of appeals is also "outside the skin." The correlation of relationships between the object concept and the motivational concept would be determined by an observer--the speaker, a polling agent, or perhaps a rhetorical critic. However, under proper experi-

mental conditions the perceptions of the observers could also be empirically verified. For example, a list of motivational concepts used by the speaker in the persuasive situation could be administered to the receivers after the persuasive communication. The extent to which the perceptions of the speaker correlated with the responses of the audience as to which motivational concepts were effective or persuasive would provide a more verifiable method of prediction than the perceptions of the speaker or an observer standing alone. By implication, the receiver in accepting the motivational appeal (activation, emotion) also accepts the causal relationship between the motivational appeal and the object concept (logic, cognition). In addition, if there were some way to measure reticular response to appeals, a physiological verification could be provided. The physiological verification would demonstrate, in terms of "inside the skin" behavior, which appeals had the most impact. To be sure, both of the above possible means for measuring the impact of appeals would be subject to the limitations and disadvantages of the experimental condition. Even so, some would argue that at least the persuader would by this means be provided with some indication, other than his own perception, as to how effectively various appeals were received in a persuasive communication or campaign.

Cronkhite's paradigm of persuasion provides an alternative to the conviction-persuasion dichotomy. It recognizes the functions of a unified nervous system and that persuasion is also a singular process that could not be subcategorized into conviction and persuasion elements. In addition, the traditional terms of logic and emotion are reconsidered in a functional sense, how they work; not what they are. The reconsideration affords the teacher of speech the opportunity to note that logic and emotion--cognition and activation--are not separate, discrete, mutually exclusive phenomena; instead he can focus on demonstrating a method for audience analysis and isolation of motivational concepts. The paradigm may also be demonstrated for the student as a method for identifying appeals used in attempts to persuade him.

Classical scholars might object to the idea that the Rowell rationale for including logic in rhetoric is only to insure attention to responsibility, truth, validity, and probability, and that if logic were not considered separately rhetoric might return to Sophistry. The argument is realistic and worth noting. However, it reinforces the need for speech teachers to develop a unit on ethics in persuasion in their speech courses; and to emphasize the importance of ethical conduct in a free society.[42]

Certainly the Cronkhite paradigm provides an alternative for those teachers of speech who are bothered by pedagogical separation of logical and emotional appeals when they know these appeals cannot really be separated. In addition, many students have difficulty in structuring syllogisms which are inevitably unrealistic when it comes to marketplace argument. They may also have other problems with formal logic. These problems may be circumvented, reapproached, or dealt with in a different light by using the Cronkhite paradigm. The emphasis would shift the "truth" or formal logic to what is found to be the "truth" for a given audience, in a given context, receiving a given communication. In other words, the paradigm provides a more adaptable method of appealing to audiences.

In addition to isolating object and motivational concepts as examples are given in the classroom, the teacher of speech would probably want to develop and discuss such issues as:

1- Audience analysis and the invention process and their importance on arriving at motivational concepts.
2- The effects of language as a motivational concept or its impact on motivational concepts.
3- Credibility as a functioning motivational concept or its impact on motivational concepts.
4- Liking of the speaker and its impact on motivational concepts.
5- Evaluation of empirical methods of motivational concept measurement.

Perelman, Toulmin and others have emphasized a need for a more practical rhetoric. A rhetoric that is not tied to the traditional rules of logic, the paradigm of persuasion suggested by Cronkhite, affords a practical alternative for measuring persuasive appeals and for teaching a method of arriving at appeals as they may apply in the persuasive process.

FOOTNOTES

1. Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, The New Rhetoric, trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. (South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), pp. 26-27.

2. Gary Lynn Cronkhite, "Logic, Emotion, and the Paradigm of Persuasion," Quarterly Journal of Speech, L. (February, 1964), p. 13.

3. A. Craig Baird, Rhetoric: A Philosophical Inquiry, (New York: Ronald Press, 1965), pp. 120-121.

4. Irving J. Lee, "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI, (December, 1939), p. 74.

5. George A. Sanborn, "The Unity of Persuasion," Western Speech, XIX-XX (May, 1955), p. 176.

6. Charles Henry Woolbert, "Conviction and Persuasion: Some Considerations of Theory," Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, III, (July, 1917), p. 258.

7. Charles Henry Woolbert, "The Place of Logic in a System of Persuasion," Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, IV (January, 1918), p. 19.

8. Mary Yost, "Argument From the Point of View of Sociology," Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking, III, (April, 1917), P. 111.

9. Ibid.

10. Woolbert, "Conviction and Persuasion: Some Considerations of Theory," p. 249.

11. Ibid., pp. 253-254.

12. Ibid., p. 255.

13. Social scientists observe human interaction patterns and draw inferences based on their observations and interpretations. See, Lawrence Grossbert and Daniel J. O'Keefe, "Presuppositions, Conceptual Foundations, and Com-

munication Theory: On Hawes' Approach to Communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LXI, (April, 1975), especially pp. 197 and 202 and their discussion of the action/behavior distinction.

14. It is granted that rhetorical theorists may have separated appeals merely for pedagogical reasons even though they could not be separated in reality.

15. Charles Henry Woolbert, "Persuasion: Principles and Methods," Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, V, (January, 1919), p. 24.

16. Edward Z. Rowell, "Prolegomena to Argumentation," Part I, Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVIII, (February, 1932), pp. 1-13.

17. Edward Z. Rowell, "The Conviction-Persuasion Duality," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XX, (November, 1943), p. 471.

18. Ibid., p. 474.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., p. 478.

21. Ibid., p. 482.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., p. 474.

24. Ibid., p. 481.

25. Several authors have written about the conviction-persuasion dichotomy or logical versus emotional appeals but are not specifically referred to in this paper. For example see: Raymond Bauer and Ronald Cox, "Rational Versus Emotional Communications: A New Approach," in Leon Arons and Mark May, eds., Television and Human Behavior, (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1963); Samual Becker, "Research on Emotional and Logical Proofs," Southern Speech Journal, XXVIII, (Spring, 1963), pp. 208-218; Theodore Clevenger and Eugene Knepprath, "A Quantitative Analysis of Logical and Emotional Content in Selected Campaign Addresses of Eisenhower and Stevenson," Western Speech, (Summer, 1966), pp. 144-150; Richard Gregg, "Some Psychological Aspects of Argument," Western Speech, XXVIII, (Fall, 1964), pp. 222-230; and Randall Ruechelle, "An Experimental Study of Audience Recognition of Emotional and Intellectual Appeals," Speech Monographs, XXV, (March, 1958), pp. 49-58.

26. Sanborn, p. 178.

27. Cronkhite, p. 13.

28. Ibid.

29. Rowell, p. 474.

30. Crohkhite, p. 13.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., p. 14.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Cronkhite, p. 15.

37. Ibid.

38. See especially pp. 21 and 55 of Kenneth Burke's A Rhetorical of Motives, (New York: George Braziller, Inc., c. 1950.)

39. Cronkhite, p. 16.

40. Cronkhite provides the following as an example of several motivational concepts in support of a single object concept. 'For example, Kennedy was undoubtedly attempting, in the 1960 election to cause his audience to perceive a causal relationship between Republican occupancy of the White House (the object concept) and a lack of vigor in our national economy (a negative motivational concept). His development did not stop there, however; he further attempted to induce a perceived causal relationship between economic doldrums and such things as job insecurity, inability to purchase new cars or furniture, and myriad other considerably more potent motivational concepts, all ultimately related to a Republican administration."

41. Cronkhite, p. 17.

42. B. J. Diggs offers some practical suggestions about ethics and persuasion in "Persuasion and Ethics," Quarterly Journal of Speech, L, (December, 1964), pp. 359-373. Richard L. Johannesen offers a more comprehensive approach in Ethics in Human Communication, (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1975), p. 163.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
at
PLATTEVILLE

DEPARTMENT
of
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS:

Speech
Radio-Television Broadcasting
Speech Education

UNDERGRADUATE EMPHASIS:

Dramatic Literature
Theatre Production
Debate and Forensics

GRADUATE PROGRAMS:

M.S.T. Speech (with UW-Whitewater)
M.P.D. (Master of Professional Development)

STUDENT-DIRECTED ACTIVITIES:

WSUP-FM and CHANNEL 6
The Players
Pioneer Debaters

FACULTY:

Radio-Television

Paul W. Gauger (Ph.D., UW-Madison)
F. Gerald Bench (M.S., University of Utah)

Theatre

Thomas P. Collins (Ph.D., Indiana University)
Thomas S. Goltry (Ph.D., UW-Madison)

Rhetoric Communication

Kenneth V. Eckhart (Ph.D., University of Denver)
Thomas J. Jonas (Ph.D., Bowling Green State University)

FOR INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Dr. Thomas Jonas; Chairman, Speech Communication; 716 Tower;
Platteville WI 53818; (608) 342-1627.

NEWS AND NOTES

(Editor's Note: The following comments were prepared by Jim Moe, UW-Stevens Point regarding some of the rationale used in formulation of the certification guidelines. The guidelines follow these comments.)

NEW GUIDELINES FOR APPROVAL OF PROGRAMS TO PREPARE "SPEECH" TEACHERS: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Effective in the Fall of 1976 the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction adopted new guidelines for approval of programs to prepare "speech" teachers. The Wisconsin Communication Association was instrumental in gaining DPI approval of the guidelines. Their adoption represents the culmination of five years of effort by the WCA to improve the standards that govern communication teacher training programs in the state of Wisconsin.

The new guidelines are grounded in five basic assumptions. First, any academic inquiry considers definition of terms and attempts to isolate disciplinary concepts an essential and effective instructional method.

Second, individuals today must choose from among a variety of media. The recognition of implications for understanding and utilizing media has become an important part of our discipline. In this connection it is also important to note that our discipline has been the academic home of mass communication, and further that the future of a broad based approach to the study of communication is dependent upon retaining that area as an integral part of its inquiry. A related problem here is the fact that persons certified in English are supposed to have had preparation in the teaching of media but, since most English curricula in Wisconsin do not typically offer media related courses, these same teachers have not had a need for this kind of course preparation.[1] Conversely, most individuals certified in "speech" have had opportunity for preparation in the teaching of media but have been denied the opportunity to teach it since "speech" guidelines did not certify such instruction. To help clarify the goals of a broad based approach to communication and to assist in providing quality programs of instruction the new guidelines: (1) Formally reaffirm mass communication as an integral part of our discipline; and, (2) Require demonstrated competencies in the area of mass communication for our future teachers. This will ensure quality preparation for those teachers and also assure the public that our teachers are receiving the proper program preparation for what they will be teaching.

Third, critical competence is essential if an individual is to achieve meaningful adaptation to his environment. Whether judging the merits of a TV commercial, assessing a political candidate's remarks, listening to a friend discuss his problems, or convincing someone why a particular movie should win an academy award, the ability to offer reasoned judgment is necessary for productive communication.

Fourth, teacher training institutions need to confront the ethical considerations of communication. It is imperative that communication teachers be trained to instill in their students a sense of responsibility for their own as well as others' communicative acts. Moreover, future teachers should be aware of the interdependency of a given culture and an acceptable communication ethic.

And fifth, the teacher of communication should recognize the importance of co-curricular activities as an extension of the academic inquiry of the discipline. Hence, co-curricular activities become more than an exercising of skill for the sake of skill. Instead, they are a means of enriching the total communication experience by giving students an opportunity to gain a special level of competence in diverse communication acts.

The old standards did not suggest a careful consideration of these assumptions and therefore fell considerably short in establishing minimally acceptable guidelines for the approval of programs to prepare "speech" teachers in Wisconsin.[2] The new guidelines more accurately represent the status of inquiry within our discipline. This should bring program approval criteria into a more proper alignment with what is actually being taught in communication at the various colleges and universities in the state of Wisconsin.

Moreover with the removal of statements in the old standards related to theatre and communicative disorders the new guidelines encourage a more systematic approval of programs. The guidelines, however, do not prescribe specific coursework nor is there any single formula for meeting them; but, rather, they identify a generally held set of core understandings within our field and in so doing encourage individual campus autonomy and innovation in generating approaches to meeting those standards.

The new guidelines are also designed to ensure an overall broader based preparation for teachers. Secondary level teachers are often called upon to teach courses that go beyond their undergraduate preparation. The new guidelines anticipate this possibility and seek to expose students to as many areas as possible within the discipline so that they may step into a variety of teaching situations. This broad based training is also benefical to the future teacher seeking employment. Job market potential increases immensely as people demonstrate an ability to teach in a wide range of areas.

The WCA should continue its involvement in shaping the destiny of "speech" certification for Wisconsin. It would seem advisable for the WCA to establish a committee (eg., Certification Planning Board) which would function as a facilitator for institutional curriculum change as it pertains to certification standards. The committee could provide guidance and assistance in gaining DPI approval of program changes and serve as certification coordinator for all willing colleges and universities in the state. Eventually such a committee might serve as a formal advising committee to the DPI. A committee structure like this could not only provide disciplinary expertise but also help initiate dialogue with school systems for purposes of enriching existing communication curricula and encouraging the establishment of such curricula where they don't already exist. Such a plan has been operant in the State of Pennsylvania and has met with high success especialiy in: (1) providing sample and model curricula, and (2) making resource persons available to every school district in the State.[3]

An inevitable problem related to certification which will probably surface in the near future is what to call the certification categories which represent communication related areas. One suggested option would be to create a broadfield communication arts category with specialized tracks in the now separate areas of Speech, English, Journalism, Theatre. One thing is certain, this task will not be easy and the WCA should be actively involved in the pro-

cess which will undoubtedly be initiated by the DPI in the near future. In the long run we should all gain from the exchange that will take place regarding this inquiry. As in the case of the new guidelines, it is hoped that the result will bring us closer together in our professional and academic pursuits.

FOOTNOTES

1. William C. Davidson, "Curricular Offerings of Wisconsin Colleges with Certification Programs in Speech, Drama, English, and Journalism," 1973. Unpublished manuscript. This compendium is available from the author upon request.

2. Until the Fall of 1976 the state of Wisconsin followed the guidelines for "speech" as set forth by NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education). They were: (1) the program shall provide for competencies in the areas of speech fundamentals, public address, oral interpretation, dramatics, and simple speech problems; (2) the program shall provide for the development of personal proficiency in oral communication; and (3) the program shall include experience with dialects and other regionalisms, regarding their origin, development, and place in contemporary culture.

3. Thomas A. Hopkins, "The Pennsylvania Speech Consultant System," Speech Teacher, Vol. 8, (January 19, 1968); also, Donald H. Ecroyd, "Abstract of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction and Pennsylvania Speech Association on a Suggested Model for Developing Speech Programs in Pennsylvania," Pennsylvania Speech Annual, Vol 25, (September, 1968).

DAVE RUPNOW IN TEXAS

WCA past president, Dave Rupnow writes that he is enjoying the warmer climate of Houstin, Texas where he is assistant professor and coordinator of the Biomedical Communications Program at the University of Texas Health Science Center.

Anyone interested in a graduate assistantship in the area of bio-medical communication should contact Dr. Rupnow at Post Office Box 20036, Houston, Texas 77025.

APPROVED GUIDELINES FOR APPROVAL
OF PROGRAMS TO PREPARE
SPEECH TEACHERS

(The following certification guidelines were adopted by the State Advisory Board on Certification this fall. The Board adopted the guidelines in much of the form recommended by the W.C.A. One recommendation that was not approved, however, was the use of the term "communication arts" in place of the older term of "speech".)

SPEECH. The following guidelines pertain to programs for preparing speech teachers.

I. The program shall require that candidates for certification in speech possess an understanding of basic communication concepts, including:

A. Various theories of communication and their application to a variety of communicative acts.

B. Function of the individual as an initiator and receiver of communication.

C. Language acquisition and development along with fundamental attendant sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors which impinge on the communication situation.

D. Context variables such as setting, purpose, audience, and subject, and their impact upon communicative acts.

II. The program shall require that candidates for certification in speech possess an understanding of various media of communication, including:

A. The changing nature of media as a result of technological and social development.

B. The way different media enable and constrain communication, i.e., effects upon participants in the communicative act, strengths and limitations of various media (radio, television, film, print, direct person to person, etc.)

C. Consideration of various communication genre, e.g., television news reporting and documentary, editorial.

III. The program shall require that candidates for certification in speech possess an understanding of critical skills associated with communicative arts, including:

A. Critical stances--their description and differentiation, e.g., comparison, motive, and form.

B. Characterization of the relationship between the critic and the critical object.

C. Identification of the social value of criticism.

D. Application of the various critical stances to a variety of communicative acts.

IV. The program shall require that candidates for certification in speech possess an understanding and ability to use practical communication skills related to academic offerings and to selected co-curricular activities.

A. Academic--public speaking, group decision making, television, radio, film, print, interpersonal communication, and organizational communication.

B. Co-curricular--directing student experiences in areas such as debate, forensics, radio management, and film society.

MINUTES

Executive Committee
Wisconsin Communication Association
October 28, 1976

Present: Ron Allen, Dick Barnes, Myrve Christopherson, Bill Davidson, Larry Larmer, Calvin Quayle, Elaine Schroeder, Bob Scott, Craig Streff, and Pat Townsend. Absent: no one.

The Executive Committee of the WCA convened at 5:00 p.m. in Room DS-428 Civic Center Campus in Milwaukee with Craig Streff presiding.

1. Treasurer.
Pat Townsend reported a balance of $1,518.98 with the cost of duplicating and mailing the WCA Journal as the only outstanding dept. Christopherson/Quayle moved that WCA allocate a budget of up to $150 for the production of public service announcements promoting the importance of communication. Motion passed.

2. Non-profit status.
Bill Davidson reported that James Wise, an attorney for Lola, is representing WCA in this project. Davidson estimated that non-profit status would be obtained before the end of the year unless a review was requested by the State Department. It that were to happen, the request would be delayed several months so that the information could be sent to Washington. Streff expressed the WCA's appreciation for Davidson's efforts.

3. Spring Convention.
1977
The convention will be at the Hilton in Eau Claire, May 6-7, 1977. Elaine Schroeder asked for reactions to general options in meals, types, times, and number of programs, and keynoter(s). The consensus was that she could operate with a budget of $1,000. The idea of a cash bar starting about 10:00 Friday night received general approval. Several persons for speeches and/or programs were suggested, capitalizing on Eau Claire's proximity to Minnesota and Canada. She will work with Interest Group Chairmen to plan programs and

members with suggestions are encouraged to contact Elaine.

1978
Schroeder reported that she is continuing to work on the 1978 site. Some of the options in the Lake Geneva area have been ruled out due to cost and special arrangemen: problems.

4. Roster of consultants and/or judges.
Larry Larmer reported that 60 to 70 percent of the information forms were returned. He is organizing that now and the roster will soon be mailed. He saw this roster as a good, but rough, first version and will start revisions immediately.

5. Regional area programs.
Larmer thanked all those who helped with any of the three programs. In his judgment the content was good but the attendance was disappointinly small--25 at Madison, 16-17 at River Falls, and 6 at DePere. The Executive Committee of WCA went on record extending appreciation to Larmer and supporting continuation of the programs next fall. Tentatively Eau Claire, Stevens Point, and Milwaukee were picked for sites. WCA will work with Larmer to obtain a local public school and college teacher in each area for liaison with Larmer.

6. Fall conference.
Dick Barnes suggested that we should continue the relationship with WEA but warned that the program chairs should not assume that WEA will do the paper work. The chair should send confirmations, etc., him/herself. The WCA programs were held at MATC because members need badges to get into Mecca, according to information given Barnes. About 36 people attended the WCA sponsored program "Communication Development Among Children" and about 40 attended the debate "Should the Power of School Boards and Their Employees to Censor Curriculum Materials and Instructional Methods Be Abolished in Wisconsin." Interestingly, most of those attending were not members of WCA.

7. Certification.
DPI approved "Proposed Guidelines for Approval of Programs to Prepare Speech Teachers" were distributed. Ron Allen said that the question of a broad field communication program is being broached. Allen, who is on the committee to investigate this possibility, is interested in getting reactions on the BFC major from methods teachers in the state. The group expressed their appreciation to Jim Moe and Bill Davidson for their work with the DPI in drawing up the certification guidelines which are now in effect as a result of WCA initiative primarily through Moe and Davidson. Streff recognized this accomplishment as one of the most significant in the past few years.

8. Cooperative curriculim proposal.
Ron Allen reported that the film curriculum had been delayed at the printers. The broadcast media project is all set. Dick Barnes is aiming for spring completion of the interpersonal proposal.

9. Contacting methods teachers.
Bob Scott reported that he had sent a letter regarding WCA membership to every methods teacher in the state--the individual if he could get a name, otherwise to the chairperson of the department. He plans on sending out a

reminder and/or invitation early next semester, probably February. Approximately ten student members have joined this semester.

10. WEA Journal.
Dick Barnes reported that the state printers are slower than their estimates. The printing is taking four weeks instead of the estimated two--on top of the thirty work days lead. The Journal was out the first part of December and was mailed by a coordinated effort of Elaine Schroeder, Dick Barnes, and Pat Townsend.

11. Next Executive Committee meeting.
The next Executive Committee meeting will be held in early spring, about six to eight weeks before the spring convention. No site was picked but the Wisconsin Dells area was suggested.

The formal meeting adjourned approximately 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
PATRICIA TOWNSEND
Executive Secretary

(Editors note: The following two items appeared in the December 1976 issue of Spectra. Since both items involve members of our association, they are reprinted in abbreviated form.)

NATIONAL COMPETENCIES PROJECT REPORT AVAILABLE

Developing Communication Competence in Children, edited by R. R. Allen and Kenneth Brown is a book representing the work of the SCA Task Force on Functional Communication Competencies in Children. Under a grant from the Axe-Houghton Foundation, the task force implemented a three-pronged study to seek answers to these questions: How do children develop speech communication competencies? What kinds of instruction would foster the development of functional speech communication at various ages?

Part One synthesizes from an exhaustive literature review the status of our knowledge about communication development including: children's acquisition of language; the relationship of language to culture; the affective components of communication (for example, in developing a positive self-image), and children's development of skills for interpersonal communication. The developmental charts based on current knowledge describe the characteristics of communication behaviors at various ages in childhood and adolescence. These should provide guidance for teachers, psychologists, parents and others who deal with children and adolescents in assessing communication behaviors and in designing appropriate instruction.

Part Two describes a field study on children's use of communication skills in everyday home, school and social situations. Part Three describes a survey of teachers' perceptions of their pupils' speech communication behaviors at various grade levels and their recommendations for the goals of speech communication instruction. In Part Four, the findings from the literature review, field study and teacher survey are synthesized into a taxonomy of communication acts with five categories useful for research and instruction: controlling, feeling, informing, ritualizing, imagining. This book is useful for researchers interested in functional communication, language acquisition and other aspects of human development and for teachers of language arts, speech, English and Psychology seek-

ing to develop curricula appropriate to children's developmental stages.

Order from: Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041; Single copies: $7.75; 5 or more copies $5.81 each. (Postage and handling charges are added to all orders not pre-paid.)

FREE SPEECH NEWSLETTER

For many years, the SCA Commission on Freedom of Speech has published a newsletter, Free Speech. The current editor is Ruth McGaffey (Department of Communication, University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201.)

Members who are interested in subscribing and/or who are interested in having their institutional library subscribe--are invited to request a free copy of the November issue; write to Free Speech/SCA, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041.

Included in the table of contents of the November Free Speech are the following: A guest commentary on "Commercial Speech," by Franklyn Haiman; "Teaching Freedom of Speech in the High School," by Elaine Schroeder; notes on recent happenings in the news and in the courts; a report on the National Coalition Against Censorship by Daniel Ross Chandler; and announcements of available free speech materials.

UWM INTERNSHIP PROGRAM EXPANDED

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Departments of Communication and Mass Communication have entered into an agreement with the Milwaukee Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America to pilot an internship program for credit with local public relations departments and firms. Under the agreement, students may earn from 2-6 credits for working under supervision of professionals in the field. This is an expansion of current internship programs offered in each of the departments. UW-M is the only university or college offering such a program in Milwaukee. If the pilot is successful, other area schools may also become involved. Internships are limited to majors in communication and mass communication.

SPRING CONVENTION OF THE WISCONSIN COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION AT EAU CLAIRE, WISCONSIN, HILTON INN MAY 6TH AND 7TH

The Spring Convention will be held with the Wisconsin Debate Coaches Association and the Wisconsin Forensic Coaches Association.

The programs for this year's convention will include:

FRIDAY, MAY 6

1:00 p.m.	Registration
2:30-3:45	1) "Interpreter's Theatre" sponsored by the Theatre Interest group. This will follow the Forensic Coaches' business meeting.

FRIDAY, MAY 6 (continued)

2:30-4:30

1) "Competency Based Self-Paced Instruction"
Speaker: Dorlis Grubidge, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
(A workshop on the use of Personalized System Instruction and Cognitive Mapping in teaching speech)

2) "Public vs. Private Communication: Reflections on Taxonomy"
a) "Public Speaking vs. Private Speaking" by Robert J. Doolittle, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
b) "Language Levels in Writing and Speaking" by Melvin H. Miller, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

4:00-5:30

1) "Violence in the Media"

2) "Teaching Interpersonal Communication in the High School"
Speakers: Judy Becker, East High School, Appleton; Gloria Kripiak, St. Mary's Springs High School, Fond du Lac

6:00-7:30

Convention Banquet
Keynote Address: Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Associate Executive Secretary, Speech Communication Association

7:45-8:45

1) "Exit Dying" A University produced TV movie.
Speakers: Robert Snyder, Robert Jacobs, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

2) "Implication of Organizational Theory for Teaching Organizational Communication," Chairman-Winston Brembech, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Participants: Myrv Christopherson, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point; Winston Brembech, University of Wisconsin-Madison

3) Status of Interpersonal Communication in Wisconsin
"Teaching Interpersonal Communication in Wisconsin Colleges and Universities." Open forum. Discussion and sharing of syllabi, conceptual and experiential materials and teaching philosophies. Interested persons are encouraged to bring materials for distribution.
Chairman: Robert Lapp, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

9:15

Interest Group Meetings

SATURDAY, MAY 7

8:30-10:15 a.m.

1) "Roots and How They Got There -- The Education of the Blacks in the Mass Media"

2) "Rhetorical Theory and Criticism: A Modularized, Mediated, Self-Paced Approach" Joseph B. Laine, University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

SATURDAY, MAY 7 (continued)

8:30-10:15 a.m. 3) "Organizational Internships and On-Site Studies -- Extending the Ealls of the Organizational Communication Classroom"
Chairman: Richard Barnes, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

10:30-12:30 1) "Resources and Trends in Communication Education: The National Scene. An Opportunity to Discuss your Needs and Interests."
Chairman: Craig Streff, President, Wisconsin Communication Association
Participants: Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, Associate Executive Secretary of the Speech Communication Association and Ron Allen, University of Wisconsin-Madison

1:00-2:00 p.m. Noon Luncheon and Business Meeting

2:00 Executive Committee Meeting

Professor Grace Walsh of University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire extends an invitation to attend the 104th Annual Contest of the Interstate Oratorical Association. Semi-finals will be held at 10:30 a.m. Saturday, May 7 and the final round will be held at 1:30 p.m. Saturday at Kjer Theatre. You are invited to bring students to these rounds.

More convention material will be sent to you later with a finalized convention program.

Hope to see you in Eau Claire on May 6 and 7, 1977!